CONTENTS

Page

Creative Preaching, J. O. Spiller 81
Gifts of the Boys, G. Thompson 91
Hind, Charles, D. 100
Knowledge, Real, Obligation 106
Methodist Sat Hist. Soc. Quarterly 117
Notes 129
Christian World 135
Book Reviews 144

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 1956 W. Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-24 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 59 ST LOUIS. MO. MARCH 1.

CREATIVE PREACHING

By J. Otto Reller

In his recent book on "An Emerging Christian Faith" Dr. Justin W. Nixon characterizes the two great divisions of Christendom by saying, "Protestantism has aimed at a type of religion which challenges the activities of the mind and the conscience as Latin Christianity has appealed to the senses and the feelings." It follows that the Protestant minister has been more of a prophet than a priest, whereas the leadership in the Roman Catholic Church has been more a priesthood than a school of prophets. It is certainly true of our Evangelical Church that preaching has received a greater emphasis than the sacerdotal rites. In the typical Evangelical church the pulpit stands above the altar.

In recent years we have noted a swing in the opposite direction,—an emphasis on worship rather than instruction. Close upon the heels of an era of reconstruction of Church School buildings for educational purposes, there followed the stressing of Gothic architecture, beautiful, uplifting worship, aesthetic surroundings, chancels, etc. The preacher himself warns the congregation against the temptation of coming to church first to hear him and places the worship of God in the forefront.

All this is good if it does not lead us to the extreme of neglecting the instruction and the prophetic element. It were nothing short of a calamity to substitute a Sunday morning bath in an emotional aesthetic uplift for the washing of regeneration. Certainly let us have more dignified worship, a growing reverence on the part of our people when they enter the House of God, but not at the ex-

pense of the pulpit. We need better preaching as well as better worship.

There is the necessity then of us taking stock of the present estate of preaching for a number of reasons:

Think of its *honorable history,* to begin with. Beginning with that mighty sermon of Peter on Pentecost and coming down to a Jowett, a Jefferson, a Fosdick and Newton and the rest, preaching has had a great career. Its place and power in the life of the past centuries is a tradition worth perpetuating.

But there are more compelling reasons why we as preachers ought to examine this our art. On the one hand there are the *masses outside* the church today. And on the other an unusual *interest in religion,*—which latter is not to be construed as meaning a feeling of love and loyalty for the church. In view of the former we preachers may well ask ourselves to what extent we, our sometimes meaningless utterances, the timelessness of our preaching is to blame; and in view of the latter we ought to be vitally concerned how we capitalize this general interest in religious questions to get the message of our Christ across to the people.

In order that we may get clearly in our minds anew just what our tasks as preachers is as far as this one function is concerned among the many which are crowding us, let us set up the proposition that our heavy obligation and our glorious privilege is that of

Creative Preaching

I. Just what are we to understand by Creative Preaching? Perhaps a *negative approach* may help us to arrive at a clearer understanding.

A. Creative Preaching is certainly not to preach for our *salary* or to maintain our *position.* This temptation is one of the subtle dangers that every minister must guard against. In the Catholic church where the congregation has no voice as to who shall minister the temptation is not prevalent. But in Protestant circles where the people can give and terminate the call at will, and that is true of our Evangelical Church, this temptation to put our ear to the ground and to watch which way the wind is blowing is a reality.

Again in some churches which are cursed with bosses or influential cliques the use of discretion is almost unconsciously practiced: sharp corners are smoothed down lest some wealthy contributor be offended. Now there is such a thing as being needlessly offensive and insulting in the pulpit, sometimes more by our manner than by our speech. That should be avoided because it is unchristian. But anything savoring of cowardice in the choice of

themes or in the championing of burning questions is an abomination. We must be controlled by the same selfless devotion as the artist, the scientist, the explorer and the pioneer in untried fields. We must live for and, if necessary, die for the cause.

B. Again Creative Preaching is not preaching for the *crowd or for popularity,* though it is more inspiring to talk to large numbers and gives us a larger opportunity in the pursuit of our task. There is a popularity that is justifiable. Jesus was a popular preacher. The Evangelist Gypsy Smith is a popular preacher. During a recent campaign in Rochester covering three weeks his audience numbered each night upwards of 3000. So we should also strive for mastery of the art of speaking to multitudes so as to hold their interest and attention, to sway the emotions and move the will. But we must avoid all cheap clap-trap theatrical methods which amuse the sensation-hunter and draw for a while the church tramp. We are not here to please men but God. Not to amuse but to convert. Even so, our utterances should draw, not repel. A prominent member of a certain Evangelical church was overheard to remark, when asked why he no longer attended church: "I will not come to church to be insulted every Sunday."

C. Creative Preaching is not to preach primarily for the defense or *perpetuation of an institution,* although it is within the institution of organized Christianity, the Church, that the opportunity to preach is offered us. To hold such views is not a sign of ingratitude toward the church but rather of the integrity of one's own soul. The words of Brutus might be applied here: "Not that I love thee, O Church, less, but that I love thee, O Truth, more." The church is not an end in itself but a means to an end, and that end, the bringing in of the reign of truth and love and peace. And when the church forgets its high mission,—and it is conceivable that she might, because she has in the past,—far from it being a mark of treachery to point this out, it is our solemn duty to speak the truth in love but unafraid.

The church, at least the Protestant Church, need not fear the truth from whatever source it comes. If loyalty followed it will do only one thing, set us free. "By its very nature" says Nixon, speaking of the Protestant church, "it must be self-critical." And he continues: "I wonder if in all the world there is an institution with such vested interests, material and spiritual, which tolerates such public criticism of its faith, organization, and methods on the part of its paid servants as does the Protestant Church. . . . Pilloried in the press, which always selects a Protestant clergyman as the subject for caricature, never a priest, so accustomed to attack that the squeamishness of Christian Scientists over Dakin's life of Mrs. Eddy seems hardly believable, described by facile writers as the

happy hunting-ground for heretics, the prospecting area where the Elmer Gantry's mine for gold, Protestantism may be conservative, schismatic, and inefficient, but if the ability to stand criticism is any test, it is not sick."

So we say that our first loyalty is not the church but the Lord of the church. Everything must be brought up to His standards and ideals.

D. And finally in stating what Creative Preaching is not,—it is not an *end in itself,* but a means to an end. Preaching is an art, a fine art but it is not art for art's sake. Doubtless there should be logical sequence, freshness of thought, clarity of expression, telling illustration, and all that, but if the technique of preaching become, perhaps unconsciously, the all important thing in the mind of the preacher, preaching defeats itself. It will be like a skyrocket, which for a moment holds the attention, but soon goes out, to leave the night as dark as before.

II. What then is Creative Preaching? What should it do?

A. Creative Preaching should *keep alive* in the human heart the *assurance of the everlasting reality of religion,*—make the unseen and eternal real.

Was there ever a time when this was more necessary than now, at least in the lives of a host of the people? Mass production has so cluttered up our pathway that it makes our going hard. Bill boards scream to us that things, possessions are the highway to the abundant life. At the fatigue-end of a week of feverish activity it is not rest, relaxation and meditation that folks think they need, but an extended auto trip or some other form of diversion or stimulus. That there is another side to our being that craves mental refreshment and spiritual uplift does not seem to be known to great masses of the people.

Or that back of this world of force and matter and laws there should also be an infinite being, who on the one hand is the great Cause of all that we see and know, and on the other "the far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves," is stoutly denied by not a few. It is no mean task to convince folks, breathing this air during six days of the week that the things that they see are temporal but the unseen is the eternal.

Now, of course, this is not a matter of proof and demonstration as a mathematical proposition. So Kant and others long ago showed us. For in this we are moving in a different sphere from that of figures, weights, measures and test tubes. However it may also be said to the comfort of those, who reluctantly and apprehensively admit the faultiness of the old proofs, that the opposite—the

unreality of religion and God, the unseen and the spiritual—also cannot be proved in that way. The existence of God, the certainty of immortality are not matters for analysis by the scientist or demonstration by the physicist but inferences and logical conclusions which we draw from certain great premises, which to believe is reasonable and rational, which to deny outrages the human understanding. The everlasting reality of God, spiritual values, etc., which Creative Preaching is to keep alive and fresh is an *assumption by faith of a spiritual attitude to life,* an assumption that for instance there is purpose in the universe, that it is more rational to believe with Paul that "all things work together for good to them who love God" than to accept the philosophy of the Persian poet who said:

"'Tis all a checkerboard of nights and days
Where destiny with men for people plays;
Hither and thither moves and mates and slays
And one by one back in the closet lays."

The very vastness of the universe which science is revealing to us, the regularity of its movements and the dependence of its laws makes it reasonable to conclude and infer that back of it all must have been and still is mind and purpose and not mere chance or coincidence. If anything has been irrevocably established it is that things do not just happen. There is a cause. And we, who call that great first Cause God the Father, do so in faith, and those who conceive of the Ultimate in impersonal terms also do so in faith. So we will not abandon the fort to those who look upon religion as old women's or young children's fables. We need not back down from our positions. Moreover we need also not only to be patient and sympathetic towards those, who, in their first contact with science, as it is sometimes taught, slip from their former moorings, but also so prepare them in the Confirmation Class, in private conversation and constructive preaching that their first immersion in the world of science will not be a shock permanently disabling them.

B. In the second place Creative Preaching nurtures faith in

a) *a Christian God,* because this revelation of the Divine as Father, Saviour, Friend, Companion, Comforter is the most lofty, most worthy and satisfying that can be imagined. Our Christian religion is the last word in these matters. There is a finality to the Christian revelation because there is nothing higher or better that we can think or ask. To be sure our understanding of and insight into these things will grow just as the child gains a fuller knowledge of the character and purposes of its parents. So our preaching should aim to develop faith in God by a closer adherence to

Jesus' conception of the Father. For there can then be only one result, viz. a desire for more vital relationship with our Father God, in terms of communion and fellowship. This need for companionship is one of the most elemental of our nature. And this need will be satisfyingly met by this vital personal relation with the power back of the universe. We will feel that we are part of something greater than ourselves and have a share in a great redemptive process.

b) Next to a strengthening of the soul in a Christian God comes faith in *Christian Character* as the secret of and open way to the most abundant life. Life is still man's most cherished possession. The lines about the man,

> "Who gave his health to get his wealth
> And then with might and main
> He turned around and gave his wealth
> To get his health again."

are true of human nature. There is an insatiable longing for life, and of course we mean not only physical well-being, but all other phases of our existence. This full abundant life which we want is not to be thought of in terms of possession—Jesus' warning that a man's life does not consist therein, will ever haunt us—neither in terms of accomplishment, i.e. getting on in the world, but rather in terms of "values". For example: Personal immortality is a self-evident proposition from this viewpoint. It is unreasonable not to believe in the perpetuation of personality and character, which is the most precious thing we know anything about. But eternal life, thus conceived in terms of values and not duration,—quality of life,—is the thing that science and reason and commonsense forbid us denying. It is faith in these values as most worth living for that we want to foster.

c) Finally Creative Preaching must nurture faith in a *Christian society,* as the end and goal of the human race. Jesus called it the Kingdom of God, which should have first place in our life, which is most satisfying to live for and supremely worth dying for. Here again we must not think of anything static. It is not something into which we shall be ushered at death as recompense for having lived a good life, but a condition of heart and character, which, by constant adjustment to the ideal of Christ, we enter and which enters us. So the Kingdom is both within us and we are within it. It is a present accomplishment and the goal of all our endeavor.

Here then is the purpose of Creative Preaching. It is a task and a life work that is fit for the very best that is in us. How un-

worthy and recreant we feel to the high and holy work we have been commissioned to perform.

III. For the rest let us speak of how we may approximate this high ideal of Creative Preaching.

A. We believe that the first thing that is essential to its attainment is *consciousness of a mission.* We must be able to make the words of Isaiah and Jesus our own: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because he has annointed me to preach." We must have heard the voice of God in one way or another—for all will not hear Him alike—just as surely as Moses heard him say: "Come now and I will send thee." Our call must be so clear to us that when the temptation comes to us to run away from our work, or to change to insurance or medicine or politics, something compels us to say with Paul: "Woe to me, if I preach not the Gospel." That were disobedience to the heavenly vision.

If a personal reference may be pardoned, I was not conscious of any "angel visitant or opening sky" in consequence of which I became a preacher. It was the wish and prayer of my father that led me to enter Elmhurst, with the privilege, however, of discontinuing at any time if it did not appeal to me. It did appeal. At first, perhaps, it was the college life with its varied activities and opportunities. But it took several years before I found myself. It was not until we were at Eden, that it gradually dawned upon me that the ministry was the place for me. I am as sure of that today as twenty years ago. To my mind there is nothing that can surpass the work of a Christian minister in quality, effectiveness and permanency. No greater joy comes to me than that which preaching brings.

I have no doubt that the majority of men in the pulpit feel the same way. Some who do not have gotten out, which is not to be regretted. There can be no creative preaching if the preacher himself has not been recreated. The preparation of the preacher must precede the preparation of the sermon. We must BE.

B. But in addition to this we must KNOW. *Knowledge* of our times, the *general trends,* hopeful and threatening, is essential. Or let us put it this way: if our preaching is to be effective in the lives of epople we must have a knowledge of past history to evaluate the present and from this perspective of past events to judge and interpret the signs of the times. We must keep abreast of the day by constant reading and study and reflection upon the things that are taking place around us in science, education and politics. These are helping to determine and shape the life of our day. And to these we must add knowledge of the fundamental needs of man,

what he needs, not what he wants; what he craves in the best moments of his life.

Besides this general background knowledge of past history and present trends and human nature, we should have the *specific* knowledge of the problems of the individuals of our flock, their joys and sorrows, their successes and failures. There is no short cut to this, no finely paved concrete road. We will have to wear out much shoe leather, or perhaps better, balloon tires and ring many bells before the hearts and lives of the people will open to us. What I am trying to say is that only through faithful pastoral visitation and sympathetic association with all members of the flock, even the least, will the minister gain that knowledge of his people that will enable him to speak helpfully and creatively.

C. My third proposition in the how of Creative Preaching is *message pressure.* We must SAY as well as be and know. Something must grip us and make it impossible for us to remain silent. Like the prophet of old burst out saying: "For Zion's sake I will not rest and for Jerusalem's sake I will not hold my peace." God knows that often enough too often, we have been lacking in this. We have dragged ourselves into the pulpit and have spoken not because we had something to say but because Sunday happens to come every seven days. But thank God we have all felt the exhiliration of being possessed by the compelling sense of something that needed to be said, and if we would not have spoken the very stones would have cried out. The preaching that radiates that will be creative.

D. *Interest content* may well follow as the next thing to be emphasized. Among other things there are five things which go to make our sermons interesting

a) Standing on *common ground* with the congregation. There is nothing that will bridge the gap on a Sunday morning between the pew and the pulpit and give the preacher a sympathetic and unprejudiced hearing as the feeling on the part of the people that the preacher is interested in their human problems and daily experiences. Even though the preacher break all the major rules of public speaking in delivering his message, he will get results where otherwise brilliant, high-powered oratory alone would fail. The story is to the point of the preacher who was being discussed by two of his parishoners after he had taken up his work in the new congregation. Said the one: "How do you like the new minister?" "Well I don't know just what to say," said the other. "During the week we don't see him and on Sunday we can't comprehend him."

b) Then, of course, there should be *simplicity of thought* coupled with freshness and a sense of getting somewhere. Long ponderous sentences, an over-emphasis on theological concepts and doctrinal matters, which are foreign to the modern mind, making too much of some passing detail which happens to strike the fancy and magnifying that out of all due proportion to the central theme —side-drift as it has been aptly called—all this confuses the hearer and loses his attention and thus defeats our purpose.

c) In our preaching happy is he who is blessed with a *vivid imagination,* upon whose soul the commonplace registers enabling him to put himself in the position of other folks and see the meaning to them of what otherwise might seem meaningless events. Here is one who is compelled to quit school to keep the family agoing; or there may be the ingratitude of an only child, the greatest disappointment in the life of that parent; to a third it may be the realization that he or she is in the wrong place in life without any possibility to change things. To feel all this in some degree as those concerned feel it enables one to say something that tends to sweeten the bitter waters of life where otherwise we would be dull and lifeless in speech.

d) *Illustration* is an indispensable factor. But not the kind that have to be pulled in by the hair or those we look up in books of illustration but rather those that come out of our broad reading, the events of the time, some account in the daily press or our contact with the people. In a word, vivid, living, dramatic, that will make the truth shine or grip.

e) And finally practical application so that our hearers not only see and understand some new truth or general principle but that they are confronted with the urgency of having these operate in their own lives. There must be the "thou art the man" element. We must lead people unwaveringly up to the real conditions actually happening in their own lives.

E. My final word is about the necessity of a *preaching program.* We need it to

a) *minister to the various groups* in our services. There are some who will be there regardless of what happens in the pulpit, those loyal, dependable, patient souls who are the consolation of one's ministry, even if they are not always the most challenging. But there are others. Restless, critical youth and not a few others with a considerable element of defeat in their lives. To meet the needs of the many we need a program.

b) We need it as well to guard against always *riding our hobby.* With one it is stewardship, with another religious education and with a third the social gospel. Now there is no denying

that each of these is of great importance. But to come around to them again and again perhaps in most every sermon and forget the other important elements, is, to say the least inexcusable and to say stronger things it is irritating and makes the average person restive and when people get in that frame of mind our influence over them is nil.

c) The rich, almost *limitless field* from which we can draw makes a program desirable. The great themes of redemption, the various aspects of the religious life and faith should whet the appetite of any growing man as the prospector in the mining field is spurned on by the discovery of a rich vein of ore.

d) Incidentally this covering of a greater part of the field, for which the church year with its various emphasis is invaluable, does something else, it prepares folks when their minds are clear for some of the *inevitable experiences* of life when their minds will be in confusion. We will be building something into their lives which will not be swept away when the rains descend and the winds blow.

e) And finally, and I am sure that this will get a sympathetic hearing from my brother preachers, a preaching program will save us from the *constant worry* incident to the silent and ominous march of the days that brings Sunday around so soon, and then we will get a sense of joy and satisfaction in our work.

And now, brethren, after having said all this, I feel constrained to confess for the good of my own soul as did a professor of homiletics, who being asked a question whether he considered this or that thing necessary in the life of a preacher, replied: "As a professor of homiletics I should say, most assuredly, but as a matter of fact I never did it myself."

In other words, not having attained I press on toward the high mark of Creative Preaching.

THE OFFICE OF THE KEYS

G. NUSSMANN

(Conclusion)

ATTENDANT DOCTRINES

1. The Primacy of Peter.

Because Peter had confessed the divinity of Christ, Christ had honored him with the position of the primate: "Thou art the rock, and on this rock I will build my Church." (Compare the quotation from Leo the Great above.) Any church not built upon it is not the Church of Christ. It is doomed to failure because it is not the work of God. In these words Christ committed into the hands of Peter—and to no one else—the power to be his visible representative on earth. To other pastors of the flock Jesus assigned a certain portion of the flock, but to Peter the lambs and the sheep, the whole of his flock. (John 21: 15-17)

Peter's name always stands first in the list of the Apostles. He was always prominent when it came to witnessing about Christ: before the multitude on the day of Pentecost, before the Sanhedrin. The first miracle recorded in Acts was performed by Peter (ch. 3). At the election of a successor to Judas Peter alone spoke. James the brother of John, was imprisoned. Nothing was done in his case by the congregation. Peter was imprisoned. In his behalf the congregation sent prayers to heaven. James died, but Peter was freed. When there was a great conference of Christian workers in Jerusalem and weighty matters came up for discussion, it was Peter who spoke the deciding words (ch. 15).

Peter was called the first bishop of Rome whither he had transferred his see from Antioch. It is there he died a martyr to the cause of Christ.

2. The Supremacy of the Popes.

The privileges and prerogatives of Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, were transferred to his successors, the bishops of Rome, in much the same manner as the authority of George Washington became that of the succeeding presidents of the United States.

In two points, however, the bishops of Rome did not claim to be equal with Peter: in the matter of inspiration and the power of working miracles. Since Christ has given them to his apostle and to the Church in its infancy it is no longer of such importance to possess these gifts when the infant has grown up.

That the popes have always exercised supreme authority from the days of the Apostles may be proved by the following facts:

A. By the fact that Rome constituted the last court of appeals in matters of faith and conduct, to witness from the many just a few examples.

a. Clement, the third successor of Peter was appealed to in a matter of contention by the Church at Corinth. The epistles which he wrote in answer to this appeal were highly valued by the recipients.

b. Cyprian, the highly honored bishop of Carthage in Northern Africa, who was martyred in 258, was in teaching, administration and attitude wholly subject to Rome.

c. Athanasius, the renowned patriarch of Alexandria once appealed to Pope Julius I to help him in the case of an unjust decision rendered against him by the oriental bishops. The Pope reversed their decision.

B. The so-called Fathers—men deeply pious and greatly learned—of the first five centuries of the Christian era have always occupied a place of honor in the minds of Christians of all denominations. These same Fathers recognized in the Pope of Rome their head.

C. The Ecumenical Councils, or general assemblies, in which the churches of the whole of Christendom were represented. These councils were either called together by the Pope or their convocation was approved by him. At all of them a representative of the Pope presided. His signature made the acts of such councils binding.

D. Missionary activity issued preeminently from Rome. It is a remarkable fact that the greatest missionary activity of Christian times emanated from Rome. Its messengers went to Ireland, Scotland, the Anglo-Saxons, France, Flanders, Germany, India, Japan and countless other places.

3. The Infallibility of the Pope

The doctrine of the infallibility of the Popes has been grossly misunderstood, so that it becomes necessary at first to point out what it is not.

a. In the first place it does not mean that the Pope is inspired. Since he possesses the inspired Scriptures he is not in need of the gift of specific inspiration. His duty is to preserve the truth thus revealed to the Apostles.

b. The Pope is not sinless. There have been a few immoral Popes but the majority of them have led exemplary lives.

c. The Pope is not infallible when he writes, e.g. as a teacher. He has no authority on fields of knowledge like science, mathematics, and political economy.

But he is infallible when he speaks *ex cathedra,* i.e. officially on questions of faith and morals. It means that in such cases the

heir of the promise given by Christ to Peter is preserved from error. When once, after prayerful deliberation, a judgment is pronounced it is final, irrevocable, and infallible.

The Catholic Church claims that this prerogative has been from the days of the Apostles. The Vatican Council of 1870 in announcing the infallibility of the Pope did not create a new dogma. It merely confirmed the old one.

The doctrine which declares the infallibility of the Pope has been called the keystone in the arch of Catholic faith. Here is the rock where all believers may find refuge.

If it be asserted that under the present conditions of human life it be impossible that any human be infallible, even in such a restricted sense, the Catholic readily retorts: "Protestants believe in an infallible Bible. But they are divided into countless sects. Where is their infallible interpreter?"

4. The Temporal Power of the Popes

It is readily understood that during the first three centuries no bishop held any real estate in Rome. The Christians were the disinherited of Rome. Their services they held in the vast underground catacombs of the City.

When Constance the Great made the Christian religion the religion of the state, persecution ended. From then on the Church increased not only in power but also in possessions. Various rulers made donations in money and estates. These grew to the proportion of a state to which history attached the name: the Papal States. The Popes had become not merely great leaders of the Church but also efficient civil rulers. How in 451 Pope Leo the Great, unarmed, prevailed upon Attila, the "Scourge of God," to turn away from Rome with his more than 500,000 men, and how the same Pope prevented the slaughter of the Romans when in 455 the Vandal Genseric with his hordes sacked the city, will always be considered as forming some of the most illustrious incidents in the history of Rome. That it is really the Popes who have made Rome the Eternal City, the Center of Christendom, the fosteress of arts and sciences, the depository of sacred learning, the city with the most wonderful works of architecture is a statement which stands undisputed.

Quite naturally, the Popes learned to make greater use of the position they had thus attained. Here is a remarkable letter which Pope Gelasius I wrote to Emperor Anastasius in 494:

"There are two powers, august Emperor, by which this world is chiefly ruled, namely, the sacred authority of the priests and the royal power. Of these, that of the priests is the more weighty, since they have to render an account for even the kings of men in the

divine judgment. You are also aware, dear son, that while you are permitted honorably to rule over human kind, yet in things divine you bow your head humbly before the leaders of the clergy and await from their hands the means of your salvation. In the reception and proper disposition of the heavenly mysteries you recognize that you should be subordinate rather than superior to the religious order. . . .

"If the ministers of religion, recognizing the supremacy granted you from heaven in matters affecting the public order, obey your laws, lest otherwise they might obstruct the course of secular affairs by irrelevant considerations, with what readiness should you not yield them obedience to whom is assigned the dispensing of the sacred mysteries of religion. . . . And if it is fitting that the hearts of the faithful should submit to all priests in general who properly administer divine affairs, how much the more is obedience due to the bishop of that see which the Most High ordained to be above all others, and which is consequently dutifully honored by the devotion of the whole Church."

It is hard to say what would have become of Roman civilization during this and following centuries if it had not been for the Church. It was she that converted, either from their heathendom or from their heretical type of Christianity, the barbaric tribes which had invaded at different times the great Roman Empire and finally caused its fall. It was the Church that taught the invaders the ways of peace.

When new hordes threatened the plains of Italy, the Carolingians came to the rescue. The State and the Church entered into an alliance and the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation came into being. But it did not exist for very long. The following centuries saw struggles between the empire and the Roman Church in which at times the one or the other seemed to succumb, or in which both were united to serve the ends of the one or the other.

By the beginning of the 13th century the crown of the Empire became a papal fief. At the end of the 13th century Pope Boniface VIII demanded in his bull *Ineffabilis* the unconditioned, unlimited freedom of the Church. In his bull *Unam sanctam* (1302) he claimed the following:

"The Church is the holy, catholic, apostolic one, which faith is obliged to accept, a body with one head, not a monster with two heads. This one head is Christ and his vicar, Peter, and the successor of Peter. There are two swords, the spiritual and the worldly; the latter must be used in behalf of the Church, the former by the Church: the one by the priesthood, the other by kings

and warriors, but according to the will of the priest and as long as he tolerates it. But one sword must be above the other and worldly authority must be subject to spiritual authority. . . . Divine truth witnesses to the fact that it behooves the spiritual power to institute the temporal power and to pass judgment on it, if it is not good."

But a few of the most significant factors of this period may be mentioned:

a. Forceful Christianization of heathen Germans
b. Investiture conflict
c. The crusades
d. Excommunication, even of emperors
e. Wars against heretics
f. The inquisition
g. The uncontested monopoly of teaching
h. The rise of the Renaissance and of humanism.

The unity of the Roman Church and the authority of the Pope seemed to be greatly shaken by the Reformation. New princes, however, allied themselves with Rome, among them especially Emperor Charles V, King Philipp II of Spain, and King Charles IX of France. On the one hand there was the Tridentine Council (1545-63) and the Counter Reformation by which the position of the Roman Church was to be restored. On the other hand the Church and various states sought to eradicate by Inquisition, by suppression, by assassination and wars all dissention from Rome.

To some extent, at least in the latter cases, Rome failed. St. Peter had to learn at last what it meant to tolerate those who differ from him. He learned it grudgingly. And his grudge still holds.

The 18th century saw the suppression of the Jesuits and the French Revolution. All religion had been abrogated by the latter as far as its influence reached. At the beginning of the 19th century the outlook for the Roman Church was gloomy. But in 1802 Napoleon concluded a concordat with the Pope whom he recognized as the head of the Church. Napoleon's universalism issued in the new universalism of the Church.

In spite of the reverse suffered in 1871 when the Pope lost Rome and the Papal States to the new Italy there was already progress to be seen in the ranks of the Roman Church.

Rebuffs which the Roman Church suffered in France (1901) and in Mexico and other places only spurned the Church to greater activity and to wiser procedure.

On February 11th, 1929, a treaty was signed by Mussolini and Cardinal Gasparri on the part of Italy and the Vatican respectively, through which a certain part of the City of Rome was

restored to the Pope. Though only very small the newly created Vatican City affords the Pope the opportunity to "exercise with full liberty and independence the mission of the papacy." Once again he is not only the ruler of Christendom, but is a sovereign who bows to no other. It is difficult to make any prediction. But it seems to be true that the "gates of Hades" shall not prevail against Peter, the Rock.

Protestant Interpretation

Luther accepted in the main the essential teaching of the Roman Church on the office of the Keys. To him the task of binding and loosing was equivalent with retaining and forgiving sins. The proclamation in and through the Gospel of the great hope of salvation from sins is laying the foundation for the execution of the power of the Keys. Where Luther differs essentially from the Catholic point of view is that he utterly rejects the claims of the Roman priesthood, to constitute the successorship to Peter. Every Christian may exercise the office of the keys and must do so in the daily walks of life where much happens that needs to be forgiven. But it is good for the believer to come to his pastor in private confession and to have absolution of sin announced to him. Official absolution and forgiveness as announced by a lay brother are not antagonistic to each other, but rather complementary; for the pastor is at bottom no more than a brother to the penitent. Probably the best presentation of the problem in question from the Lutheran point of view is contained in Article 28 of the Augsburg Confession, of which an extract is as follows:

"About the Power of Bishops."

". . . . Our people teach that the power of the keys or of the bishops be, according to the Gospel a power and mandate of God to preach the Gospel, remitting and retaining sins and administering the sacraments. For Christ commanded his Apostles and sent them out (John 20), 'As the Father hath sent me,' etc., and (Mark 16: 15), 'Preach the Gospel to every creature.' . . . (Rom. 1: 16) 'The Gospel is the Power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.' Because the power of the Church grants eternal verities and is entirely concerned with the ministration of the Word, it does not encroach upon civil administration. . . . For civil administration deals with different matters from the Gospel. The former does not defend the souls but one's body and possession against manifest injuries, and coerces men with the sword and by corporal punishment, so that it preserve civic righteousness and peace.

"Therefore ecclesiastical and civic powers are not to be confused. The ecclesiastical power has its commission to preach the Gospel and to administer the sacraments. It shall not butt into

anothers' business, shall not transfer the powers of the world, shall not abrogate the laws of the magistrates, shall not annul lawful obedience, shall not impede judicial procedure in either civil or business realms, shall not prescribe laws to the magistrates on the nature of the state; for so said Christ (John 18: 36): 'My kingdom is not of this world,' and (Luke 12: 14): 'Who made me a judge or advisor over you?' And Paul said to the Philippians (3: 20): 'For our citizenship is in heaven.' (2 Cor. 10: 4) 'For the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds.' "

Melanchthon agreed in the whole with Luther only that he laid greater stress on the fact that the office of the keys was essentially a prerogative of the ecclesiatics. Later Lutheran theologians came closer to the Catholic conception.

Calvin understood the office of the keys to consist in the preaching of the Gospel, just as Luther. But in its administrative aspect he held that it pertained to the phase of the organization and administration of the Church. In the former case the office served to strengthen the faith life, in the latter it helped to create and maintain proper discipline.

Of the great dogmatists of more recent times it was Schleiermacher who included the office of the keys in his system: Der chrisliche Glaube. He excludes the preaching of the Gospel from his conception of the clavis. To him this is the disciplinary power of the Church, based on the office of Christ as a king.

Though there was such dearth of proper definition and clear conceptions of this doctrine on the part of Protestant theology there was no lack in practical application. Beginning with Luther and Calvin and their adherents each group was conscious of the fact that it alone possessed a knowledge of the truth. False believers were thus easy to find. Ridicule and condemnation of others was much in vogue. Here was the same spirit of intolerance that had been condemned in the Catholic Church. A well known example which comes close home to us is the curse of John Wilson, the minister of First Church, Boston, which he pronounced upon Anne Hutchinson, who later together with Roger Williams founded Rhode Island: "Therefore in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the name of the Church I do not only pronounce you worthy to be cast out, but I do cast you out and in the name of Christ I deliver you up to Satan, that you may learn no more to blaspheme, to seduce and to lie, and I do account you from this time forth to be a heathen and a publican and so to be held of all the brethren and sisters of this congregation and of all others."

Times have become better. Denominations draw closer to-

gether. Some have united. Men study each other. They learn as a result to value each other ever higher. Good must come from this.

Thoughts on the Office of the Keys

In the answer which Peter gave the Lord: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" Christ saw the work of the Father upon the soul of his disciple; the glow and admiration of one who had met the answer to the quest of his life.

Peter was no coward, but he was naturally far from being a rock. Peter was just human. All those resemble Peter, whose innermost has been touched by the Father, who in the faithful performance of their task as stewards have ever clearer seen the glory in the face of Jesus as it is reflected in the faces of those who have been saved from sin. On them the kingdom of God rests.

In the interpretation of figures of speech one must trace their use. Apparently "bind" and "loose" were used in the manner in which the Old Testament passage (Isa. 22: 22) indicates it. This is at least the way in which his disciples must have understood it. For the words "forgive" and "retain" were spoken after the resurrection.

Christ endowed Peter with power, but this power was coupled with obligation. It could not have meant power in the sense of physical force. Christ's "kingdom was not of this world." "Christ came not to be ministered unto but to minister." He warned his disciples not to follow the example of human masters: "Ye shall not be so: but he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger, and he that is chief, as he that doeth serve." Luke 22: 26.

Human beings existed first. The state followed. The disciples were first, then came the Church. Which is more important? All-important is, that "Christ is the chief cornerstone of the foundation of the Apostles and prophets." (Eph. 2: 20)

The power to forgive is not a magic but a moral power. Christ gave his life for the sins of the world. Only if men are willing to drink his cup—to suffer vicariously—will they be able to forgive sins.

In a sense Christendom forgives sins and retains sins, consciously and unconsciously, in the proportion in which it opens the Gospel to the world and seeks to save lost sinners. "Let a man so account of us, as of ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." (1 Cor. 4: 1.) "For we are a sweet savor of Christ unto God, in them that are saved and in them that perish; to the one a savor from death unto death, to the other a savor from life

unto life. And who is sufficient for these things?" (2 Cor. 2: 15, 16)

Do we need an infallible guide? No, and yes. We cannot have an infallible human being because there is none, not even in the sense in which the Catholic Church describes the Pope. Nowhere in the Scriptures is infallibility promised. Even if we had an infallible Bible we should have no infallible interpreter. And yet, we need an infallible guide. It is God's *Spirit,* manifest in *Life* everywhere, within us and without. The trouble is, men build themselves fences. In attempting to guard their life, they hem it in. If individual and church would only put their religion to a test, to dare to see it die, only to have it rise again, cleansed from dross! "For freedom did Christ set us free: Stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage!" (Gal. 5: 1) Not Peter here, nor Paul there, nor Apollos yonder, but Christ everywhere.

The "gates of Hades," spiritually and morally perverse forces, shall not be able to annihilate the Church which has life, and in which and through which *Life* becomes manifest.

AN AUTHORITATIVE LIFE OF PRESIDENT ELIOT*

HAROLD E. B. SPEIGHT
(Professor of Biography, Dartmouth College)

Mr. Henry James has rendered a notable service to all who have a serious interest in our democracy, its basis in common enlightenment, its need for leadership of superior quality, and the educational processes by which both good leaders and good followers are assured. It is not too much to say that because Charles W. Eliot "stood head and shoulders above his contemporaries for forty years" in the field of higher education, "he was one of the men with whom the student of American history in the nineteenth century will have to reckon." All such students will have cause to be thankful that the Life of Dr. Eliot has been written by so competent a man of letters, so discerning an interpreter and critic of men, as Henry James. The two volumes devoted to Charles W. Eliot provide us with a very thoroughgoing study of a man who, almost in a class by himself, is to be remembered by his individual contributions to America's greatest educational institution and through it to the whole country.

By judicious selection Mr. James has been able to show us how Eliot carried his convictions into effect in the most characteristic interests to which he devoted himself. Discovering in this way the principles upon which Eliot acted, he dispenses with what might easily become, in the record of so long and so full a life, a tedious process of repetition. Yet such selection does not mean that the comprehensiveness of Eliot's mind escapes the reader. On the contrary, we marvel constantly at the range of his exact knowledge, the reliability of his memory, and the breadth of his sympathies. He made himself an effective master of more situations than it is easy to believe one man could compass even in so long an active career as President Eliot's.

With happy characterization of the families whose finest qualities mingled in Charles W. Eliot and of the Boston in which he grew up, with keen insight into the course of his mental development under somewhat unusual conditions, with entire frankness in recognizing the limitations of his early environment as well as its high privileges, Mr. James shows how remarkably the endowment of Eliot and the conditions of his times matched one another. "The peculiar disposition and the age never suited each other bet-

---

*Charles W. Eliot: President of Harvard University, 1869-1909. By Henry James. Two volumes. (Houghton Mifflin Company. $10.00.) 1930.

ter than in this case." The result, as the biography shows, was "a personality of unusual self-consistency." We can not escape the conclusion that among the factors in Eliot's great achievements this must be reckoned as one of the most important: to his life-work, when he found it, he brought a nature and a disposition and a mental endowment perfectly adapted to the long struggle through which alone lay the one way to success. No one alien to Boston and Harvard traditions, no one temperamentally unable or indisposed to recognize the conditions he had to deal with, could conceivably have transformed the educational policy and methods of Harvard College and University as did President Eliot.

Another factor we can not overlook is his health and vitality. The keen ardor of a well-controlled body, along with the power of a disciplined mind, carried Dr. Eliot through labors, conflicts, inquiries, routine, and emergencies that would have killed any man emotionally unstable, or of less than heroic vitality. Indeed, profoundly sympathetic as he was to those in any difficulty, he seemed to feel that people had no right to be anything but well and strong. In one of his last years of active service he asked his secretary to describe to him what a headache was really like, for he had never known one! And his feats of endurance and strength, his skill with the oar, the sail, and the reins, his enthusiasm into old age for the bicycle, reveal a true athlete.

He was apparently a keen judge of men, but his understanding was the result not so much of intuitive reactions as of careful observation. Long faculty meetings which bored and irritated his colleagues when he was leading Harvard through the trying period of transition, were for him a supreme opportunity to study his staff, and he was as eager to discover the strength and fine qualities of those who opposed him (and as ready to promote them) as he was determined to replace men who did not know what they believed and could not justify their preferences. Wherever he met people with whom he could talk, from whom, by searching questions, he could inform himself, he gathered and stored up in a prodigiously exact memory materials from which he drew logical conclusions that were afterwards the basis of action. Even the sickness of his wife and children during a visit to Europe was turned to good account through his discovery that "the whole system of medical education in this country needs thorough reformation." (The words are from his first annual report, and the challenge thus made was repeated in appropriate action until he had indeed brought about a reformation.)

Dr. Eliot was a great fighter for what he saw to be a truth that called for expression. "Better to lose fighting," says Mr.

James, "for something first rate than to achieve a vulgar success." But in all the long succession of fights in which Dr. Eliot was engaged for the first rate things he believed in, there was only one failure. (He failed to convince the governing boards and faculty that the college should graduate men after a shorter term of studies.) The College Entrance Examination Board was first suggested by Eliot in 1877, but it did not become a reality until 1900. Few men would have continued patiently to press for a reform for so long. In the course of the inevitable conflicts which his reforms involved it was impossible not to make enemies, for situations arose in which individuals stood in the way of progress for the institution. When asked, after he had been president of Harvard for a few years, what quality he thought most essential for a college head, he answered, "The capacity to inflict pain." The almost Olympian aloofness, which was in part the expression of a temperament explained by inheritance and certain conditions in his early life and in part a deliberate measure of self-protection adopted by a very young president of a venerable institution, exposed Dr. Eliot to criticism; but no student of this Life can escape the conclusion that Harvard owes much to that very detachment, that stoical calm, that steadiness of purpose and freedom from strain, which baffled generations of Harvard men and kept at arm's length even those who felt affection for the president.

The specific reforms for which Eliot and those whom he enlisted in his cause were responsible can only be suggested here. He himself summarized them under a number of heads. The reorganization of the medical school, together with far-reaching modifications of methods of training students; the remaking of the Law School, based upon the use of the case-method and the services of men who were teachers of law rather than part-time instructors whose first interest was in law practise; the reorganization of the Divinity School as an institution for the scientific study of religion free from sectarian emphasis; the replacement of compulsory religious services by wholly voluntary services conducted by ministers of various denominations; the requirement that entrants to the professional schools should have first obtained college degrees; the co-ordination of the various departments of the university; the perfecting of the elective system, of which more shall be said; the increase of endowments and of the number of students (from 1,316 students in 1870 to 4,123 in 1910; endowments of under two and a half million dollars in 1870 to nearly twenty-three million in 1910); and finally the improvement in the quality of the teaching staff. Eliot himself repudiated credit for these reforms as a personal achievement, and made generous acknowledgment of

the help he had received, but, as Mr. James puts it, there was one captain on the ship throughout the forty years, and that captain had set his course.

The reform which had greatest influence on educational method and won widest attention was that involved in introducing the "elective system," giving to the student wider freedom of choice in planning his college course. Formalists who had inherited and were content with an ideal program supposed to be perfectly fitted to all young men naturally opposed Eliot bitterly. It must be made clear that his motive was not to make college easier or more of a junket for slackers; on the contrary, it was the desire to give the student a chance to be really thorough in something. "To that end let him begin to exercise an option at an earlier age." Eliot believed it to be "a waste for society, and an outrage upon the individual, to make a boy spend the years when he is most teachable in a discipline the end of which he can never reach, when he might have spent them in a different discipline which would have been rewarded by achievement." By way of freedom to pursue a natural bent, he saw, lay the only sure road to studies that quicken the mind and ripen character.

Dr. Eliot was a great believer in joy, the joy that comes in and through work well done. "Joy in work has been the source of a large part of the satisfactions of my life." The implications of this conviction were not exhausted when he had opened to students a larger measure of choice, and therefore of joy, in their work. He applied the same conviction to industrial problems. "The winning of satisfaction and content in daily work is the most fundamental of all objects and unless content can be won on an immense scale, the hopes and ideals of democracy can not be realized. Therefore joy in work should be the all-pervading subject of industrial discussion; for it is at once motive, guide and goal." Those were brave words and they are words with which we shall have to reckon some day.

The strength of President Eliots' religious convictions, a strength which revealed itself both in frank and passionate aversions and in respect for varieties of experience and belief, his keen interest in public affairs, the unique experience of offers (from two Presidents belonging to opposing parties) of the ambassadorship to Great Britain—these are matters of common knowledge, but Mr. James persents them very skilfully. Less well known to the general public was the private side of Dr. Eliot's life, the very beautiful relationships he enjoyed with his family and closer friends, the adventure and fun of the summer days on Mt. Desert and in his sailing boat, the warm friendship for such men as Bryce, Dr. Wal-

cott, and a few others, the simplicity and genuineness of his interest in humble people. And these are necessary for the completeness of the picture. One reader's mind goes back to a summer day when he was close to ninety but enjoyed a whole day's sail among the islands near Mt. Desert. He clambered ashore on an island at noon over a stony beach, entered heartily into the enjoyment of a quiet picnic, and then, while his guest explored the little island, slept for half an hour between two overcoats laid on the ground. Awakening fresh for the run home in the afternoon, he took up again the endless questioning which in this particular case could hardly have brought him any valuable information and certainly proved something of an ordeal, though at the same time a memorable privilege, for his guest. The intimacies of Dr. Eliot's life are opened to the reader with excellent taste and proper restraint by Mr. James. They only confirm the impression of greatness which is left by the record of his public work.*

*Reprinted from the *Christian Leader* by permission.

Theosophie, Anthroposophie, Christengemeinschaft.

Von Prof. Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

I. Theosophie.

Theosophie bedeutet dem Wortsinn nach Gottes Weisheit, Erkenntnis Gottes. Die Tiefen der Gottheit sollen durch menschliche Erkenntnis durchleuchtet werden. Dem Menschen genügt es nicht auf dem Weg des Glaubens, des Vertrauens dem offenbarten Gott zu begegnen, sondern er will sich durch Spekulation seines Geistes auch des verborgenen Gottes bemächtigen. Diesen Weg schlug schon die alte **Gnosis** ein, indem sie orientalische und griechische Philosophie mit dem Christentum verband und dadurch ein merkwürdiges Gemisch kühnster menschlicher Spekulationen mit der christlichen Offenbarung herstellte. Von der Kirche zwar offiziell verworfen, ging doch eine theosophische Unterströmung auch durch das Mittelalter, um besonders bei Mystikern wie Ekkehard deutlich hervorzutreten. Auch in der Reformationszeit fehlten theosophische Elemente bei den sogenannten Schwärmern nicht. Aber zu einer selbständigen Macht wird die Theosophie erst bei Denkern, die sich mit Beginn der neuzeitlichen Philosophie prinzipiell von der kirchlichen Offenbarung und dem religiösen Weg des Glaubens lösten, um durch freies Denken sich der Erkenntnis Gottes zu bemächtigen — im engeren bald im loseren Anschluß an die christliche Gottesvorstellung. Im engeren Sinn zu Theosophie gehört das Gedankensystem Jakob **Böhmes** (gest. 1624), der eine Lehre von der Theogonie, dem Werden Gottes entwarf und zeigen wollte, wie sich erst allmählich aus einem dunklen Urgrund, der Geist und Materie, Gut und Böse noch ungeschieden enthielt, Gott entwickelte und dann der ganze Weltprozeß. Im 18. Jahrhundert erscheint — in starker Zuwendung zur Natur und unter Heranziehung von Visionen als Theosoph: **Swendenborg** (gest. 1772), an den sich eine noch heute existierende, wenn auch zahlenmäßig sehr kleine Gemeinde der Swedenborgianer anschloß.

Stärker dem Christentum verband sich „die heilige Philosophie" Christian **Oetingers** (gest. 1782). Ende des 18., Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts gewann die Theosophie den Charakter einer Zwischen-Wissenschaft zwischen Theologie und Philosophie bei Männern wie dem katholischen Denker Franz von **Baader** (gest. 1841) und dem protestantischen Philosophen **Schelling** (gest. 1846), besonders in der letzten Periode seiner wandlungsreichen Ideenwelt in der Philosophie der Mythologie und Offenbarung. Von ihr aus drangen einzelne theosophische Elemente — etwa im Verständnis der Dreieinigkeit, der Menschwerdung, der Entstehung des Bösen — auch

in die protestantische Theologie des 19. Jahrhunderts ein. Aber bei aller Sonderentwicklung gehört doch die bisher geschilderte **abendländische Theosophie, besonders in ihrer neueren Entwicklung, in den geistigen Umkreis des Christentums hinein.**

Dagegen hat **die moderne Theosophie ihre entscheidenden Wurzeln in Indien** und beginnt erst in ihren letzten Ausläufern wie der Christengemeinschaft und dem Neugeist auch an die abendländisch-christliche Theosophie stärker anzuknüpfen. In Indien aber liegen die Urströme nicht in dem in der Erkenntnis skeptischen, in der Lebensstimmung pessimistischen Urbuddhismus, sondern vielmehr in dem vorbuddhistischen Brahmanismus und dem nachbuddhistischen Hinduismus. Der gesamte indische Geist war durchaus intellektualistisch gerichtet und traute es sich zu, auf dem Weg eines besonders geschulten Denkens das innerste Wesen des Göttlichen zu erfassen. Dieses Göttliche erkannte er pantheistisch in allen Dingen, nie in der Gestaltung des menschlichen Schicksals. Das menschliche Schicksal vollzieht sich in der Wanderung der Seele durch verschiedene Daseinsformen, die je nach dem Karma verschieden determiniert sind. Allein gerade auch auf diese Bestimmtheit kann der menschliche Wille Einfluß gewinnen, so daß dem göttlichen Schicksal die menschliche Aktivität neben, ja übergeordnet wird. Durch Entbindung besondrer okkulter Kräfte, aber auch durch die Stärkung des sittlichen Willens kann der Mensch seinen Lebensweg in immer höhere und reinere Sphären aufsteigen lassen. Dazu wird ihm vor allen Dingen auch die liebende Pflege brüderlicher Beziehungen zu allen Menschen ohne Rücksicht auf soziale, nationale, konfessionelle Unterschiede helfen.

Diese allgemeinen Gedankengänge bilden die Grundlage der modernen Theosophie. **Räumlicher Ausgangspunkt einer organisierten theosophischen Gesellschaft ist Amerika.** In New York wurde 1875 eine „Theosophical Society" gegründet. Ihre Schöpferin war eine 1832 in Südrußland geborene Generalstochter Helene **Blavatsky.** Sie hat ein unstetes und eigenartiges Leben geführt, dann in sich okkulte Kräfte entdeckt, die ihr die Schau überirdischer Welt vermittelten und als Offenbarung höherer Geister galten und die sie zur Grundlage ihrer Weltanschauung und Gemeinschaftsgründung machte. Bald aber entdeckte sie, daß ähnliche Erlebnisse und Gedankengänge auch früher schon in der Geschichte der Menschheit aufgetreten seien. Mit ihnen beschäftigte sie sich mehr und nannte ihr erstes größeres Werk nach einer ägyptischen Göttin: „Die entschleierte Isis." Vor allen Dingen aber fühlte sich Frau Blavatsky von der „Weisheit des Ostens" angezogen und siedelte darum mit einer andern führenden Persönlichkeit, dem amerikanischen Obersten Olcott, nach Indien über. Dort fand in **Benares**

1879 die Neugründung der Theosophischen Gesellschaft statt, die bald ihr Hauptquartier nach Adyar bei Madras verlegte. So wurde Indien auch räumlich der eigentliche Ausgangspunkt der modernen Theosophie. Die Adyar-Gesellschaft gewann seit 1907 einen großen Aufschwung wiederum durch eine Frau Annie **Besant**, einer 1847 geborenen Engländerin, die mit außerordentlicher geistiger Energie und organisatorischer Tatkraft noch heute mit dem Bischof Leadbeater diese theosophische Gruppe lenkt. Die amerikanische Theosophie spaltete sich wieder in zwei Gruppen, von denen die jüngere die hervorragendere wurde. Ihr Hauptsitz wurde Point Lama in Kalifornien, ihre erfolgreiche Vertreterin wurde wiedeum eine Frau, Katharina **Tingley**.

Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts fand die Theosophie auch in Europa, speziell in **Deutschland** stärkere Verbreitung. Ihre Organisation nannte sich „Internationale theosophische Verbrüderung." Zu ihr traten noch Filialen der schon genannten amerikanisch-indischen Gesellschaften. Im Weltkrieg 1917 schlossen sich die verschiedenen deutschen theosophischen Gruppen enger zusammen; ihr Hauptsitz wurde Leipzig mit einem rührigen theosophischen Verlag, der eine Reihe theosophischer Zeitschriften herausgab. So hat die Theosophie äußerlich im 20. Jahrhundert in Asien, Amerika, Europa stärkere Verbreitung gefunden, aber auch innerlich eine festere geistige Formulierung ihrer Fundamente vorgenommen. Zu diesen Fundamenten gehört einmal: „Die Erforschung der okkulten Naturgesetze und allgemeine Weckung der in der Menschennatur schlummernden höheren Kräfte und Fähigkeiten und deren Anwendung zum Wohl der Menschheit." **Die Theosophie pflegt mithin theoretisch und praktisch den** — von uns schon im Januarheft dieser Zeitschrift geschilderten — **Okkultismus.** Das geschieht bald mehr in phantastischer Anerkennung spiristischer und magischer Erscheinungen, bald aber auch in mehr nüchterner wissenschaftlicher Weise in der Linie der modernen Parapsychologie.

Darüber hinausgehend vertritt aber die Theosophie **eine besondre Weltanschauung, deren Grundideen und hauptsächlichsten Ideale indischer Herkunft sind.** In einem 1931 erschienenen Aufsatz einer theosophischen Zeitschrift wird die Leistung der Theosophie kurz dahin zusammengefaßt: „Die theosophische Philosophie bringt dem Menschen das Wissen von seiner Konstitution und seinem Schicksal. Sie wirft ein klares Licht auf die Methode, durch die er von Stufe zu Stufe in Weisheit, Kraft und Gnade hineinwachsen kann." Die Lebensrätsel der so ungleichen Menschenlose werden erklärt durch die Reinkarnation, die **Seelenwanderung.** Der gegenwärtige Zustand ist bedingt durch das Verhalten in einem vorangehenden. Das Karma, das Schicksal des Menschen, ist Produkt des

eigenen Handelns. Ist das aber der Fall, so kann der Mensch durch entsprechendes Verhalten in der Gegenwart seine Zukunftsentwicklung beeinflussen und zwar soll er das im Sinn einer ethischen Reinigung und Höherentwicklung tun.

In der Theosophie tritt praktisch das Göttliche als eine dem Menschen übergeordnete Macht immer mehr in den Hintergrund. Der Mensch, bezw. das Göttliche im Menschen übernimmt die Führung seines eigenen Lebens, ja wird letztlich zur weltenlenkenden Schicksalsmacht. **Damit aber entfernt sich die Theosophie von der Religion und speziell dem Christentum mit seiner entschiedenen Ueberordnung Gottes über den Menschen,** der göttlichen Gnade über den menschlichen Willen. Dazu tritt vom christlichen Standpunkt das Bedenken, daß die Seelenwanderung — abgesehen von ihrer tatsächlichen Unbeweisbarkeit den Ernst und die Bedeutung des irdischen Lebens des „Jetzt und Hier" abschwächen kann. Die Möglichkeit in andern Lebensformen Versäumtes nachzuholen, kann Anlaß werden, hier die Hände lässig in den Schoß zu legen. Die Theosophie ist allerdings optimistisch bestimmt, indem sie als Regel eine stetig aufsteigende Linie in der Entwicklung des Einzelnen wie der Menschheit annimmt. Die Wiedergeburt wird nicht wie im Buddhismus als traurige Notwendigkeit immer neuen Sterbens, sondern als die Ermöglichung stetig neuen, höheren Lebens verstanden. Hier wird eine indische Lehre von dem europäisch-amerikanischen Fortschrittsgeist erfaßt und stimmungsmäßig wie willentlich — Indien gegenüber — umgestaltet. Aber wie das **Christentum** nicht den buddhistischen Pessimismus teilt, so **vermag es sich auch nicht mit dem schrankenlosen und universalen Optimismus der Theosophie zu identifizieren.** Die tatsächliche religiös-sittliche Bewegung ist immer eine doppelte, sie geht sowohl abwärts wie aufwärts.

Aus der indischen Voraussetzung der wesentlichen schon naturhaften Identität aller Menschen leitet die Theosophie das Ideal eines allgemeinen Bruderbundes ab. Zu seinen Fundamenten rechnet sie darum: „Die Bildung des Kernes eines die Menschheit umfassenden Bruderbundes ohne Unterschied der Rasse, der Nation, des Geschlechtes, des Glaubens, des Standes, und der gesellschaftlichen Stellung." Besonders auf religiösem Gebiet macht sich eine synkretistische Tendenz geltend, die nicht nur alle Formen indischer Religiosität, sondern auch Mohammedanismus und Christentum in eine **Allerweltsreligion** einbeziehen will. Damit aber tritt die **Theosophie in Spannung mit dem Christentum,** das bei aller Anerkennung der auch in andern Religionen vorhandenen Wahrheitselemente wie der schöpfungsmäßigen Gleichheit aller Menschen, doch Anspruch auf eine spezifische und absolute geschichtliche Offenbarung erhebt,

die auch die in der Geschichte gewordenen Unterschiede der Menschheit nicht einfach ignorieren will.

Zusammengefaßt bedeutet: **Theosophie in der Gegenwart eine geistige Richtung, die theoretisch und praktisch okkulte Fähigkeiten im Menschen pflegt, die Lösung letzter Lebensrätsel durch Seelenwanderung und Karma vollzieht, dem Menschen Hoffnung und Ansporn zu steter Höherentwicklung gibt, eine brüderliche Vereinigung aller Menschen gerade auch in der religiösen Sphäre erstrebt.**

Eine Krisis in der theosophischen Bewegung entstand durch die Proklamierung eines neuen Weltenerlösers in Krishnamurti, von dem der nächste Artikel handeln wird. Infolgedessen trat der bisherige Führer der deutschen theosophischen Bewegung, Rudolf Steiner, aus ihr aus und gründete die Anthroposophie.

II. Die Anthroposophie.

Rudolf **Steiner** wurde am 27. Februar 1861 in Kraljevic in Ungarn als Sohn eines katholischen Bahnbeamten geboren. Er stand in früher Jugend als Ministrant unter dem Einfluß des katholischen Kultus. Dabei zeigte er schon die besondern Fähigkeiten, die sittlichen Eigenschaften verschiedener Priester in bald glänzenden, bald abstoßenden Farben zu schauen. Er behielt sein Leben lang die Gabe, in den Geistern der Menschen zu lesen und sie dementsprechend zu beeinflussen. Daneben entwickelte er aber auch die Fähigkeit höhere Wirklichkeiten zu schauen, wie in der Vergangenheit und Zukunft unsrer Welt zu lesen. **Neben diesen „okkulten" Seiten seiner Persönlichkeit,** die ihr schon im äußeren Ansehen eine eigentümliche Fremdheit und Ferne, ja einen gewissen dämonischen Charakter gaben, **pflegte Steiner auch seine reichen intellektuellen Anlagen durch ernstes wissenschaftliches Studium.** Er wandte sich der Philosophie zu und behandelte schon in seiner Doktordissertation wie in einer Reihe andrer Schriften Fragen der Erkenntniskritik und der menschlichen Willensfreiheit. Er interessierte sich aber auch für die Naturwissenschaft und geriet hier auch weltanschaulich unter den Einfluß Häckels. Sein eigentlicher geistiger Führer wurde jahrelang Goethe. Er arbeitete am Goethearchiv in Weimar und gab auch einige Goetheschriften mit heraus. Von Nietzsche blieb er nicht unberührt. So hatte Steiner die Einflüsse führender abendländischer Geister in Weltanschauung und Wissenschaft schon in sich aufgenommen, als er 1900 Mitglied und bald auch **Generalsekretär der Deutschen Sektion der Indischen Theosophischen Gesellschaft wurde.** Sein hohes Ziel wurde eine Synthese westlichen und östlichen Geistes und damit die Schöpfung einer neuen Weltanschauung und Lebenshaltung. Ihr widmete er sich mit ungeheurer Energie, besonders seit 1913 durch Abfassung zahlreicher Schriften, durch Haltung von Vorträgen, die teilweise zu-

nächst als Geheimkonzeptionen nur Eingeweihten zugänglich wurden. Zugleich aber stellte er seinen starken Willen in den Dienst der Schaffung einer neuen Organisation und ihrer Auswirkung auf den verschiedensten Gebieten des kulturellen Lebens der sozialen Ordnung, der Erziehung. Während des Weltkrieges suchte er sogar Einfluß auf die innere und äußere Politik zu gewinnen. Nach dem Krieg machte er zum Zentrum seiner Bewegung Dornach bei Basel in der Schweiz. Hier wurde nach seinen Entwürfen ein eigenartiger Bau, das Goetheanum gebaut, das zum inneren wie äußerem Zentrum einer besondern geistigen Bewegung wurde. 1924 starb dieser ganz ungewöhnlich geistig begabte und praktisch schöpferische Mann, den man — rechtverstanden — einen **modernen Magier** nennen kann. Trotzdem die ganze Bewegung von seiner Persönlichkeit ins Leben gerufen war, zeigte sie sich nach seinem Tod doch so gefestigt, daß sie bisher in ungeminderter Kraft und in Durchführung auf die verschiedensten Gebiete gegenwärtig besteht.

Dr. Steiner hat seiner Richtung dem viel richtigeren — im Grund schon auf die ganze moderne Theosophie zutreffenderen — Namen der **Anthroposophie, d. h. Weisheit des Menschen oder Weisheit vom Menschen,** gegeben. Denn der Mensch und nicht Gott ist das eigentliche Subjekt und in der Hauptsache auch Objekt dieser modernen geistigen Bewegung. Wir beschreiben zunächst den besonderen **Weg** und dann den hauptsächlichsten Inhalt der Anthroposophie vor allem auf Grad der knappsten Zusammenfassung in Steiners eigenem Werk: „Die Geheimwissenschaft im Umriß." — Die gewöhnlichen wissenschaftlichen Methoden, wie sie Natur- und Geisteswissenschaften und philosophische Erkenntnistheorie ausgebildet haben, reichen zwar aus, um die uns umgebende Welt zu erfassen. Dagegen ist „das menschliche Erkennen, sowie es im alltäglichen Leben und in der gewöhnlichen Wissenschaft arbeitet, wirklich so beschaffen, daß es in die überirdische Welt nicht eindringen kann." Zu diesem Zweck müssen besondre Wege und Kräfte ausgebildet werden. Diese hat die Menschheit in früheren Jahrhunderten besessen, dann aber verloren. Allein „das Erkennen des Menschen kann wieder verstärkt, erkräftet werden, wie das Sehvermögen des Auges verstärkt werden kann." Hauptsächliche Mittel sind Meditation und Kontemplation — worin die Inder Meister waren. Die Seele muß sich ganz bestimmten Vorstellungen hingeben, wozu sie durch alleinige Aufmerksamkeit auf bestimmte Objekte, wie etwa eine Blume erzogen wird. Andre Gedanken werden dabei unterdrückt. Genau so soll die Seele ihre Gefühls- und Willensregungen in die Hand bekommen, um durch Geistesschulung zuletzt zu erlangen: „die Herrschaft über die Gedankenführung, die Herrschaft über die Willensimpulse, die Gelassenheit gegenüber Lust und Leid, die

Positivität in der Beurteilung der Welt, die Unbefangenheit in der Auffassung des Lebens."

Dieser ersten Stufe folgt die Herausbildung höherer Wahrnehmungsorgane, die **hellsichtig** machen. Der Mensch entdeckt diese in der eigenen und fremden Körperlichkeit, in farbigen Gebilden „Lotosblumen," die die seelischen und sittlichen Eigenschaften der Menschen andeuten. Aber auch die vergangene und zukünftige Geschichte dieser Welt, wie die Gefilde einer höheren Wirklichkeit breiten sich vor dem Geistesauge aus. Eine solche vollendete Befähigung wird zunächst allerdings nur wenigen Menschen erreichbar, ja im Grund hat sie nur Steiner selbst besessen. Die übrigen Geistesschüler müssen diese Mitteilungen autoritativ im Vertrauen hinnehmen. Der so selbständig begangene Weg anthroposophischer Erkenntnis wird für die Meisten zu einer Führung, bei der sie ganz genau in die Fußtapfen des Meisters zu treten haben, um das zu sehen, was er ihnen zeigt. **Eine Art katholischer „fides implicita" wird gefordert,** d. h. ein Glaube, der ohne Schauen und Wissen das annimmt, was eine autoritative Instanz ihm vorschreibt. Auf der andern Seite aber macht sich Steiners Verlangen auch schon in der Methode strenge Geisteswissenschaft zu bieten dadurch bemerkbar, daß er alle Ergebnisse seines besondern Erkenntnisweges kontrollieren lassen will durch das „gesunde vorurteilsfreie Denken" und in den Zusammenhang mit den allgemeinen wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnissen einstellen möchte.

Der **Inhalt** der Anthroposophie wird in dem Satz zusammengefaßt: „Es werden eine Reihe von Mitteilungen gemacht über das Wesen des Menschen, über ganz bestimmte Vorgänge in jenem Reich, zu dem der Tod die Eingangspforte bringt, über die Entwicklung des Menschen, der Erde, des ganzen Sonnensystems." Erster Gegenstand ist eine besondre **Psychologie,** bei der sich Steiner sehr eng an indische, schon von der Theosophie wiederbelebte Behauptungen anschließt. Danach wird der Mensch in neun, in der Regel aber nur sieben Bestandteile zerlegt: 1. physischer Leib, 2. Aetherleib, 3. Astralleib, 4. Ich, 5. Geistselbst, 6. Lebensgeist, 7. Geistmensch.

Die ersten vier gehören enger zusammen, sind wesentlich noch irdischer Art, obwohl schon Astralleib und noch weniger Ich materiellen Charakter tragen; die letzten drei sind rein geistiger, jenseitiger Art. Diese Differenzierungen haben hauptsächlich den Zweck, um einmal okkulte Vorgänge in diesem Leben, dann aber die Weiterentwicklung im Jenseits verständlich zu machen. So gilt z. B., daß der Astralleib während des Schlafens in die Harmonie des Weltalls zurückkehrt und dem Menschen dadurch besondre harmonische Kräfte zugänglich macht. Im Tod trennt sich zunächst der physische Leib vom Aetherleib. Solange der letztere noch besteht,

besitzt der Mensch eine Erinnerung an sein vergangenes Leben. Nach seinem Schwinden bleibt nur noch der Astralleib übrig, durch den eine stärkere Verbindung mit dem gesamten Kosmos erreicht wird. Ist auch dieser verfallen, so beharren allein die rein geistigen Bestandteile der menschlichen Persönlichkeit, die immer weiter in das reine Geisterland emporsteigen. Hier wird das letzte Ziel — bei dem es undeutlich bleibt, ob es ein persönliches Fortleben oder ein Aufgehen im Nichts oder im Gottesgeist ist — von den Wenigsten sogleich erreicht. Die Meisten müssen auf die Welt zurück. Der Geist baut sich infolgedessen die Elemente für ein neues physisches Dasein. **Seelenwanderungs- und Karmalehre werden auch in der Anthroposophie festgehalten:** „So wirkt also das vergängliche Leben bestimmend auf das neue; die Taten dieses neuen Lebens sind durch jene des vorigen in einer gewissen Weise verursacht. Diesen gesetzmäßigen Zusammenhang eines früheren Daseins mit einem späteren hat man als das Gesetz des Schicksals anzusehen; man ist gewohnt es als Karma zu bezeichnen." **Auch der Anthroposophie gegenüber bleibt die christliche Antithese bestehen, die in diesem Leben die letzten Entscheidungen fallen läßt** und sie auf immer neue Daseinsformen verteilt. Ist mit dem Christentum zwar nicht eine gewisse Entwicklung im Jenseits unvereinbar, so doch nur eine solche, die stetig tiefer in die Gemeinschaft Gottes führt, nicht aber eine anthroposophische, die plötzlich vom Hochgebirge des Geisterlandes wieder ein Abstieg auf die Erde für möglich hält. Auch vom rationellen Standpunkt befriedigt dieser anthroposophische Gedankenkreis in keiner Weise. Er setzt nur nach rückwärts und nach vorwärts immer neue Glieder an die Kette der Lebensbewegung ohne ein absolutes und endgültiges Woher oder Wohin.

Indem als das bewegende Rad der ganzen menschlichen Entwicklung die Tat des Einzelnen erscheint, wird das Schicksal nur noch zu einer dekorativen Formel, es verschwindet als religiöse Kategorie, als Symbol einer unabhängigen, aber alles wirkenden Macht. Das Schicksal wird abgelöst durch die Allmacht des menschlichen Willens, der sich nicht nur seine geistigen, sondern auch seine physischen Bedingungen schafft. **Der Anthropos ist Schöpfer; die Anthroposophie eine durchaus anthropozentrische, moralistische Lebensanschauung.** Infolgedessen begegnen bei ihr zwar mythologische Geisterwesen aller Art, niemals aber das klare und deutliche Bekenntnis zu einem allmächtigen und absoluten Gott. **Ein Polydämonismus tritt an die Stelle des Theismus, Mythologie ersetzt Offenbarung.**

Ein merkwürdiges Gemisch von Mythologie, Naturwissenschaft und Geschichte stellen auch die anthroposophischen Enthüllungen über die **Vor- und Urgeschichte der Welt und die Entwicklung unsrer**

Erde dar; von ihnen weiß der Geisteswissenschaftler aus dem Lesen in der sogenannten Akascha-Chronik „Den unvergänglichen Spuren alles Geistigen." Der Uranfang war rein geistiger Art, aber in einer nicht festzulegenden Zeit ist der Geist in die Stofflichkeit übergangen — ein Ereignis, das zugleich Beginn wie Sündenfall des Weltprozesses bedeutet. Dieser verläuft in sieben Stadien, von denen die drei ersten zunehmende Verstofflichung bringen. Ueber den Wärmezustand (Saturn), Gaszustand (Sonne), Flüssigkeitszustand (Mond) hat die Welt den gegenwärtigen Erdenzustand erreicht. Auch auf ihr hat sich eine Entwicklung von höherer Geistigkeit zu stärkerer Stofflichkeit ergeben. In der urfernen Vergangenheit „bestand der Mensch noch aus einer feineren, weicheren Stofflichkeit als er später angenommen hat." In dieser zunehmenden Materialisierung besteht auch der Niedergang der Menschheit, über deren einzelne Stadien der Geisteswissenschaftler nur in sehr loser Anknüpfung an äußere Geschichte berichtet. Er erzählt von der „hyperboräischen, der lemurischen, atlantischen, der urindischen, urpersischen, chaldäisch-babylonischen, ägyptischen, der griechisch-römischen." Die gegenwärtige Zeit soll um das Jahr 1250 v. Chr. ihren Anfang genommen haben.

Ueberlassen wir die Kritik der Einzelheiten den zuständigen Natur- und Geisteswissenschaften und beschränken wir uns auf die **des weltanschaulichen Grundgedankens, so wiederholt sich in ihm nur die alte neuplatonisch-gnostische Behauptung von dem Sündenfall des Geistes in die Materie.** Die christliche Anschauung sieht dagegen in der Materie als solcher noch nichts Sündiges und Geistwidriges, sondern in ihr vielmehr einen Bestandteil der göttlichen Schöpfung. Das Sündige liegt vielmehr erst in einer falschen Willenseinstellung zu Gott, die dann auch eine Verhältnisverschiebung des Geistigen zur Materie im Gefolge hat. **Sowohl in der Schöpfungs- wie in der Sündenauffassung trennt eine weite Kluft das Christentum von der Anthroposophie.**

Dieser Gegensatz muß sich dann auch in der **Erlösungslehre** auswirken. Auch in ihr wandelt Steiner in alten gnostischen Bahnen. Die Erlösung besteht in der Befreiung des Geistes aus der Materie, in der zunehmenden Spiritualisierung des einzelnen Menschen wie der ganzen Menschheit. In diesem Prozeß wird — wieder genau wie in der alten Gnostik — dem **Christentum** eine bedeutsame Rolle zugewiesen. Auf der Sonne war bei ihrer Loslösung von der Erde ein hohes Geistwesen, „der Christus," verblieben. Dieses hohe Sonnenwesen, das zugleich den Charakter des idealen Menschen trug, ist mit der menschlichen Gestalt des geschichtlichen Jesus eine gewisse Verbindung eingegangen. In seinem Leben offenbarten sich die geistig-sittlichen Ideale, vor allen Dingen

das brüderliche Handeln und Lieben. Von noch größerer Bedeutung ist sein Sterben: „In jenem Augenblick, da sich das Ereignis von Golgatha vollzog, war die andre Anlage der Menschheit eingeimpft, wodurch der Einfluß Ahrimans zum Guten gewendet wurde." **Der teuflisch materielle Stoff wird durch einen höheren geistigen („Impfstoff") verdrängt,** der die kosmische Entwicklung der Menschheit wieder ihrem geistigen Ausgangspunkt zurückgeführt. Unter dem Einfluß der „Christusweſenheit" beginnt die Rückentwicklung zur ursprünglichen Geistigkeit über „Jupiter, Venus, Vulkan." **Das Christentum ist danach für Steiner wesentlich eine kosmische Erscheinung, Christus „der Mittelpunktsgeist der Erde," der die Entmaterialisierung der Erde und des Menschen entscheidend beeinflußt und ihre Wiedergeistwerdung beschleunigt.** In diesem Sinn hat Steiner die urchristliche Ueberlieferung und besonders wichtige Stücke wie das Vaterunser umgedeutet. Auch hier sind die einzelnen Gewaltsamkeiten und Wunderlichkeiten nebensächlich gegenüber dem prinzipiellen Gegensatz zwischen Steiner und der kirchlichen, sonderlich protestantischen Auffassung des Christentums. **Für Steiner ist Christus weder Gott noch Mensch im vollen Sinn.** Christus ist nur ein hohes Sonnenwesen, ein gnostischer Aeon, ein arianisches Zwischenwesen zwischen Himmel und Erde. Da Steiner keinen wirklichen Vatergott kennt, kann er auch nicht einen Sohn Gottes im gleichen Sinn annehmen. Aber auch die Verbindung des Christus mit einem Menschen ist nur eine zeitweilige und nicht wirklich enge. Der alte Doketismus, der Christus nur zum Schein mit Jesus sich verbinden läßt, schlägt hier wieder deutlich durch. **Die Erlösung ist ein mythologischer und naturhafter Vorgang.** Die alten Vorstellungen von der Teufelsverdrängung schlagen wieder durch nicht minder die Annahme, daß es sich um die Einflössung eines neuen Geistesstoffes in die derbere Stofflichkeit handelt. Auch hier wirken bei Steiner deutlich **altkirchlich griechische und mittelalterlich katholische Anschauungen** nach. Die protestantische Auffassung dagegen von der Erlösung als Bewirkung und Offenbarung einer neuen, gnädigen und vergebenden Gesinnung Gottes in Jesu Leben und Sterben, ihre Vermittlung durch Wort und Geist, ihre Annahme im vertrauenden Glauben fehlen ganz. **Das von Steiner vertretene Verständnis des Christentums ist darum gerade vom christlich-protestantischen Standpunkt als ein durchaus außerkirchliches zu betrachten.** Er selbst hat mit der christlich-kirchlichen Religion ein möglichst neutrales Verhältnis einzuhalten und sowohl Konflikte wie eine engere Verbindung mit ihr zu vermeiden gesucht. Eine engere Verknüpfung seiner Gedankenwelt mit dem Christentum hat sich erst die Christengemeinschaft zum Ziel gesetzt.

III. Die Christengemeinschaft.

Die Christengemeinschaft verdankt ihre Entstehung Pfarrer Dr. **Rittelmeyer** (geb. 1872). Lange Jahre in Wort und Schrift ein hervorragender Vertreter der sogenannten modernen Jesusverkündigung und liberalen Theologie kam er seit 1915 in Beziehung zur Anthroposophie Rudolf Steiners, worüber er in seinem Buch „Meine Lebensbegegnung mit Rudolf Steiner" berichtete. Diese regte ihn zu dem Versuch einer immer engeren Verbindung zwischen Christentum und Anthroposophie an. Im Jahre 1922—1923 begann Rittelmeyer eine sogenannte **Christengemeinschaft** ins Leben zu rufen. Ueber diese sprach sich noch Steiner selbst dahin aus: „Die anthroposophische Bewegung wendet sich an das Erkenntnisbedürfnis und bringt Erkenntnis, die Christengemeinschaft wendet sich an das Auferstehungsbedürfnis und bringt Christus." Rittelmeyer seinerseits betont zwar, daß die Christengemeinschaft auf kein Dogma auch nicht auf das anthroposophische verpflichte, fügt dann aber hinzu: „Hat ein Glied der Christengemeinschaft Erkenntnisbedürfnis, so können wir Führer der Christengemeinschaft, die wir selbst aus der Anthroposophie so reich beschenkt wurden, ihm die Hilfe dann aus der Anthroposophie darreichen."

Das eigentliche Gewicht aber legt die Christengemeinschaft nicht auf die Christuserkenntnis, sondern auf die in Christus wirksame Kraft und deren Geltendmachung. Christus ist lebendig schaffende Gegenwart und wird als solche erlebt. Der Gegenstand für das Schaffen Christi ist die gesamte Erde und er heißt darum **„Christus aller Erde."** Diese die Erde erneuernde Wirksamkeit vollzieht sich durch menschliches Handeln und zwar im besondern Maß durch priesterliche Wirksamkeit in einem besondern, sakramentalen **Kultus.** Die Priester der Christengemeinschaft fühlen sich wie das Blut, das zur Reinigung und Stärkung immerwieder ins Herz zurückkehren muß, um dann alle Seiten des Weltkörpers mit Leben erfüllen zu können. Schon Christus selbst soll alles, was er anrührte, zu einem Sakrament gemacht haben, d. h. zum Erdenträger göttlicher Wesensstrahlung, das Urchristentum wesentlich eine Sakramentsreligion gewesen sein. Im Katholizismus und seiner Messe wird darum das Wesen des Christentums erhalten, aber — wie Rittelmeyer sagt — doch in Formen, die in vergangener Zeit ihre Wahrheitsgröße besaßen, aber vom lebendigen Geist der Gegenwart immer stärker als fremd empfunden werden. Infolgedessen schuf Rittelmeyer einen neuen sakramentalen Kultus. In seinem Mittelpunkt steht **„die Menschenweihehandlung."** Dieser Ausdruck ist grammatisch und sachlich dahin zu verstehen, daß der Mensch Subjekt der Handlung ist. Der Priester bringt Welt und Mensch dar, um dann sie von Gott neu geweiht zu empfangen: „Wir bringen

Christo im Abendmahl unsre Erde dar in ihren ausgereiftesten Erzeugnissen und bitten ihn darin nahe zu sein. Unsre Erde empfangen wir dann wieder erneuert aus dem Christus." Dieses kultische Handeln, das sich im weiteren Verlauf sehr eng an die katholische Messe anschließt soll nicht weniger bedeuten als eine Fortsetzung des weltschöpferischen Prozesses und seiner Reinigung von der Befleckung, die er durch den Menschen empfangen hat. In diesem Sinn ist das kultusmagische Handeln auch zugleich sittliches: „Stark fängt die Ethik erst an zu werden, wenn man etwas davon spürt, wie das heilige Umschaffen wirken kann bis ins Körperliche hinein, zunächst im Menschen, dann aber durch den Menschen und weit über den Menschen hinaus." Die Christengemeinschaft hat das außerordentlich hohe Selbstbewußtsein, „daß Christus sie selber zu seinem Organ geschaffen hat. Mächtig schreitet schon heute Christus durch die Weihehandlungen der Christengemeinschaft."

Nach einer Mitteilung von 1928 sind etwa in 40 deutschen Städten bisher Gemeinden, wenn auch zum Teil mit nur kleiner Anhängerzahl entstanden. Trotzdem hat sich bisher die Christengemeinschaft noch nicht zu einer selbständigen, religiösen Sekte oder Kirche zusammengefaßt. Aber durch ihre Einrichtung besondrer Gottesdienste, sakramentaler Handlungen, wie der Trauung, Schaffung eines eigenen Priesterstandes mit abgestufter Hierarchie, **ist der Weg zu einer besondern Organisation neben den bisherigen Kirchen beschritten.** Ein solcher entspricht auch allein dem inneren Gehalt. **Denn ihre weltanschauliche Grundlage bleibt durchaus die anthroposophische** und zwar gerade auch hinsichtlich der Bedeutung, die sie dem Christus gibt, so daß die dort gegebene Beurteilung der Distanz zum Christentum nicht noch einmal wiederholt zu werden braucht. **Das Besondere der Christengemeinschaft besteht ausschließlich in ihrem Kultus.** Dieser greift aber auf die magische Auffassung des Kultus in außerchristlichen Religionen zurück, die ihre Spuren im katholischen Kultus hinterlassen haben. **Der Kultus der Christengemeinschaft dagegen verleugnet die spezifisch protestantische Gottesdienstauffassung** von der Verbindung Gottes und des Menschen durch das geistige Wort. **Die Christengemeinschaft ist daher ebenso wie Theosophie und Anthroposophie eine durchaus außerkirchliche Bewegung.**

Die Autorität der Bibel.

Von Dr. C. Schieler.

Bei den Christen aller Zeiten, namentlich bei den Reformatoren, war der eigentliche Quellpunkt der Autorität der Heiligen Schrift **„die sich immer wieder erneuernde Erfahrung ihrer einzigartigen Erbauungskraft."** Und diese Kraft offenbarte sich in dem unmittelbaren Gefühl des Christen, daß er durch den rechten Gebrauch der Bibel in eigenartiger Weise im Glauben und im ganzen religiösen Denken, Fühlen, Leben gefördert wird. Diese Erbauungskraft ist **einzigartig.** Kein andres Buch hat eine solche. Dies beruht darauf, daß uns in der Bibel in authentischer und lebensvoller Weise die Tatsachen der göttlichen Offenbarung, deren Mittelpunkt Christus selber ist, **vergegenwärtigt** werden und uns zugleich eine authentische **Deutung** derselben gegeben wird. Indem dies geschieht, fühlen wir uns berührt und ergriffen von einem eigentümlichen Wehen des sich bezeugenden Heiligen Geistes. Es ist, als rede Gott zu uns. Unzählige haben diese erweckende, heiligende, reinigende, erhebende, stärkende und tröstende, mit Gott vereinigende Kraft erfahren und erfahren sie noch. Das ist die Bibel als **Erbauungsbuch;** sie ist aber auch zugleich das Buch, welches die Lehren unsers evangelischen Glaubens enthält und zwar einzig und allein, im Unterschied von der katholischen Kirchenlehre, welche an erste Stelle die Tradition, die kirchliche Ueberlieferung stellt, dargestellt in den Aussprüchen der (unfehlbaren!) Päpste, allgemeinen Konzilien, der sogenannten einstimmigen Lehre der Väter. Die Bibel alleinige Quelle des Glaubens ist Reformationsprinzip. Indessen lassen sich die beiden Charaktereigenschaften der Bibel, als Erbauungs- und Lehrbuch, nicht absolut trennen.

Worauf beruht aber nun diese der Bibel einzigartige Bedeutung? Sie ist Gottes Wort, enthält die göttliche Offenbarung. Dies führt uns zur **Inspirationslehre;** sie ist Gottes und nicht Menschen Wort, weil die Verfasser der einzelnen biblischen Bücher in irgendeiner Form vom Heiligen Geist **inspiriert** waren. Wer eine solche Inspiration nicht zuläßt, erklärt damit, daß er eine spezifische Bedeutung und Dignität der biblischen Bücher für Leben und Lehre der Christen nicht anerkennt. Für ihn ist die Bibel nichts anders als ein durch Alter und Inhalt wertvolles Buch. Als solches behandeln es viele Bibelkritiker früherer und jetziger Zeit, die Inspirationslehre als einen veralteten, durch die Resultate moderner theologischer Wissenschaft überholten Standpunkt betrachtend. So schreibt, um nur ein Beispiel anzuführen, **Bernhard Weiß** in seinem Dedikationsbrief zu seinem Leben Jesu, S. 11: „Für mich beruht die Heiligkeit der Neutestamentlichen Schriften und ihre bin-

dende Autorität nicht auf einer dogmatischen Konstruktion der Inspirationslehre, welche im Prinzip jede wissenschaftliche Richtung innerhalb der Theologie, auch die strengste, lange aufgegeben hat, mit deren Konsequenzen aber zu brechen sich die Wenigsten entschließen." Mit dieser Annahme dürfte sich der gelehrte Herr Professor und Bibelkritiker doch getäuscht haben. Wir wollen aber doch in die Gedankenwelt desselben noch einen weiteren Blick tun. Er schreibt ferner: „Ich habe in diesen Dingen (seinen Quellenstudien über das Neue Testament) zu viel im Detail gearbeitet, um nicht immer wieder zu einem unausweichlichem Entweder-oder gedrängt zu werden. Das Einzige, was ich für die Verwertung der evangelischen Quellen beanspruche, ist das, was ich aus der **geschichtlichen Untersuchung ihrer Entstehung** mit voller Sicherheit folgern zu können glaube." Aber er meint, daß der Nichttheologe an dieser seiner Behandlungsweise der Evangelien weniger Anstoß nehmen werde, als der Theologe, der „aus ihr leicht dogmatische Konsequenzen zieht," die er nicht anerkenne. Und er muß zugestehen, daß die Resultate seiner biblisch-kritischen Forschungen, die er des öfteren als gründliche, objektive, langjährige preist, „das Bild Christi nicht zeichnen, wie es der gläubigen Anbetung der Kirche vor ihrem erhöhten Heiland entspricht, sondern wie es vom Standpunkt seines irdisch-geschichtlichen Lebens aus erscheint." Er will aber nicht von dem Geist des Rationalismus oder der modernen Bibelkritik angesteckt sein, die er Schritt für Schritt bekämpfe. Er ist einer der vielen modernen Theologen, welche von irgendwelcher Inspiration absehen und mit einer gewissen „Pietät" die biblischen Urkunden behandeln. Dem Glauben der Kirche, der Demut fordert, sind sie abhold und konstruieren sich einen Glauben wissenschaftlicher Forschung. Werden sie damit die sogenannten gebildeten Stände für Glauben, Religion und Kirche, sowie religiöses Leben gewinnen können? Ich bezweifle es sehr. Aber das ist gewiß, diese Gelehrten erregen in vielen jungen Theologen Zweifel, unklare Vorstellungen, Irrewerden am Glauben ihrer Kirche, welcher sie doch dienen sollen, erzeugen jene traurigen Erscheinungen im theologischen Leben, welche ohne Freudigkeit, nur aus Pflicht ihre heilige, erhabene Aufgabe, Lehrer, Zeugen der Wahrheit zu sein, ausführen. Da muß die evangelische Heilsverkündigung der nötigen Kraft und Salbung und damit des höheren Segens entbehren.

Wer aber eine Inspiration anerkennt, leitet, wie Nitzsch (S. 212) ausführt, diese Bücher auch dann im weiteren Sinn wenigstens mittelbar aus einer Inspiration ab, wenn er die Erklärung für deren Eigenart lediglich darin findet, daß die gläubigen Verfasser den Ereignissen, um deren Bezeugung oder Deutung es sich

handelt, in einer solchen Weise und unter so besondern Umständen nahe standen, wie in späteren Generationen niemand. Nun aber sind verschiedene Formen der Inspiration wohl zu unterscheiden. Bedeutsam ist die Unterscheidung einer **Schrift-** und einer **Personalinspiration,** ferner (für die erstere) die einer **Verbal-** oder nur **Realinspiration;** aber auch innerhalb der Annahme einer Realinspiration und wiederum der einer Personalinspiration gibt es verschiedene Arten.

Beschäftigen wir uns zunächst mit der **Wirklichkeit** und **Möglichkeit** der Inspiration.

Aus der Annahme, daß das Christentum Wahrheit ist, ergibt sich von selbst das Postulat einer Inspiration der biblischen Schriftsteller, da die Bibel und sie allein Quelle des christlichen Glaubens ist. Ob nun, erklärt der Dogmatiker Ebrard, die biblischen Schriftsteller dieser Inspiration wirklich teilhaftig gewesen, kann nicht äußerlich aus diesem oder jenem Merkmal bewiesen, sondern nur aus dem Gesamtinhalt der Heiligen Schrift erkannt werden. Man könne nicht erst aus dem und dem beweisen, die Bibel sei inspiriert, und hinterher daraus folgern, daß man deshalb an alles, was in ihr steht, unter anderm auch an Christum glauben müßte; sondern erst müsse man Christum aus der Schrift als Erlöser erkannt und liebgewonnen und die Stillung des Erlösungsbedürfnisses durch ihn erfahren haben; dann gelange man durch den Glauben an Christum zum Glauben an sein Wort. Damit stimmt Dorner überein (in den Jahrb. für deutsche Theologie, Bd. 6). Früher Unverständliches und Anstößiges werde allmählich aus dem Mittelpunkt heraus klar, und mit der Ueberzeugung von der kräftigen Wahrheit des Christentums befestige sich von selbst die von der lauteren Wahrheit des Wortes Gottes. „Es gibt keinen andern Beweis für die Inspiration der Heiligen Schrift, als die Darlegung ihres Inhaltes in seiner Notwendigkeit," schließt der erwähnte Dogmatiker.

Was die **psychologische Möglichkeit** der Inspiration betrifft, so wendet man des öfteren dagegen ein, daß sich die Individualität bei jedem biblischen Autor deutlich bemerkbar macht, als ob der Einfluß des Heiligen Geistes die individuelle Eigentümlichkeit verwischen müsse. Aber gerade der heiligende Einfluß des Geistes Gottes ist es, welcher die schlummernden persönlichen Anlagen weckt und zur Entfaltung bringt. Den besten Aufschluß über die psychologische Möglichkeit der Inspiration gibt die Stelle 2. Petri 1, 20. 21: „Und wir haben um so fester das prophetische Wort, an welches euch zu halten ihr wohl tut als an ein in wüstem Ort scheinendes Licht, bis daß ein Tag aufleuchte und ein Morgenstern aufgehe in neuren Herzen, dies zuvörderst erkennend, daß alle Schrift-

weissagung eigner Deutung nicht unterliegt. Denn nicht durch Willen eines Menschen erging je Weissagung, sondern vom Heiligen Geist getrieben redeten von Gottes wegen Menschen." Die Werkzeuge, deren Gott sich bediente, waren Männer vom Heiligen Geist getrieben. Das eigne Glaubensleben, welches sie mit den übrigen teilten, bildete Grundlage und auf dieser fand dann das Angetriebensein vom Heiligen Geist statt. Man wende hier aber nicht ein, das von Petrus hier Erklärte gelte nur vom Alten Testament der Bibel, von den biblischen Schriftstellern des Alten Testamentes, insbesondre von den Propheten; es gilt in noch höherem Sinn von den Schriftstellern des Neuen Testamentes, von den Augen- und Ohrenzeugen der Tatsachen der Erlösung. Wenn das Christentum die wahre Erlösung ist, so **mußte** Gott, wenn er seinem eignen Zweck nicht zuwiderhandeln wollte, es notwendig fügen, daß die Erlösungstatsache von Männern beschrieben und dargestellt wurde, in welchen das treue historische Wissen von den historischen Tatsachen und das innere Erlösungsbedürfnis samt dem Glauben an die geschehene Erlösung sich gegenseitig vollständig durchdrangen. Und da diese Männer eben doch nur schwache Menschenkinder, dem Irrtum und der Sünde unterworfen, waren (vgl. Gal. 2, 12 f.), so muß angenommen werden, daß Gott die von ihm erwählten Autoren für die Dauer ihrer schriftstellerischen Tätigkeit in außerordentlicher Weise durch seinen Heiligen Geist überwachte und leitete. Daraus ergibt sich das **Postulat einer Inspiration.**

Nach den seitherigen Darlegungen ist ein Zweifaches ganz ausgeschlossen: erstlich die Ansicht, als ob nicht heilige Männer Gottes, sondern Maschinen geschrieben hätten, d. h. als ob diese nur maschinenmäßige Werkzeuge des Heiligen Geistes gewesen, oder als ob der Heilige Geist ihnen irgendwie diktiert hätte, was sie schreiben sollten; sodann ist aber auch ausgeschlossen, als ob dieselben in dem Sinn inspiriert und vom Heiligen Geist erfüllt gewesen wären, wie es alle Frommen sind. Die Inspiration betrachten wir am richtigsten als ein **Charisma**, ein auf der Basis des Glaubenslebens stattfindendes außerordentliches Charisma (vgl. 1. Kor. 12—14). Daß ein solches Charisma stattgefunden, bezeugt die Bibel selbst teils in der bereitsangeführten Stelle 2. Petri 1, 21, teils in 2. Tim. 3, 16; alle **Schrift von Gott eingegeben** ist nütze zur Lehre usw., worin also nicht bloß den Autoren, sondern auch dem von ihnen Geschriebenen das Prädikat „von Gott eingegeben" beigelegt wird. Dieses Charisma ist aber die höchste Spitze der ganzen Reihe jener außerordentlichen Charismen der apostolischen Zeit, weil die schriftliche Bezeugung des Heiles für die Gesamtheit aller Generationen und Nationen naturgemäß wichtiger war als die mündliche Bezeugung einer einzelnen Rede. Seiner Form nach

hatte dies Charisma der Inspiration nicht zur Folge, daß ein **jeder** Autor die **ganze** Heilswahrheit hätte darstellen müssen und ein gegenseitiges Sichergänzen ausgeschlossen gewesen wäre (vgl. Rothe, Stud. und Krit. 1860). Vielmehr war Zweck und Folge jenes Charisma lediglich dies, „daß jeder Autor, in seiner schriftstellerischen Tätigkeit begriffen, durch einen innerlichen, mit seinem geistlichen Leben in innersten organischen Zusammenhang stehenden, aber für diesen Zweck spezifischen und supranaturalem Einfluß des Heiligen Geistes vor der Einmischung positiv-irriger Elemente gnädig behütet wurde." Ein Analogon bietet uns das Leben manches Christen, der in seinem sittlichen inneren Leben vor Fehltritten, zu denen er von außen versucht wird und in die er vermöge seines dermaligen Zustandes zu geraten Neigung hätte, durch eine momentane und spezifische Einwirkung des Heiligen Geistes gnädig bewahrt wird. Das Ergebnis der Inspiration ist (nach Rothe und Ebrard) dies, daß „jeder einzelne Teil der Heiligen Schrift uns, wenn auch nicht ein dem Umfang nach **vollkommenes**, doch ein der Qualität nach **wahres** Bild des jedesmaligen Gegenstandes gibt." Was **Art und Form** der Inspiration betrifft, so weist man auf zwei durch die ganze Bibel sich hinziehende konstante Gesetze hin; das eine davon bezieht sich auf das **schreibende Subjekt**, das andre auf das **zu offenbarende Objekt**. Je mehr der Schriftsteller, das göttliche Werkzeug, noch ungefördert und ungeläutert im geistlichen Leben ist, desto mehr ist die Form der göttlichen Offenbarung eine solche, wobei der Mensch passiv ist, das wache Seelenleben aufhört (Traum, Vision, Ekstase, vgl. 4. Mose 12, 6—8); je mehr aber das göttliche Werkzeug durchläutert und geheiligt ist, desto mehr tritt sein freies Seelenleben in den Dienst Gottes (vgl. Jesaias, Johannes). Je mehr (2) das zu **offenbarende Objekt** dem subjektiven Erlösungsbedürfnis und der subjektiven Erlösungsaneignung angehört, desto mehr tritt des Autors waches Seelenleben in den Dienst Gottes (vgl. Jes., Jerem., Ev. Joh., Briefe Joh.); je mehr hingegen das Objekt es mit der faktischen Seite der Erlösungstatsache zu tun hat (z. B. Weissagungen von Ort und Zeit des Kommens Christi bei Daniel, von den Weltreichen ebenda, Weissagungen von den letzten Dingen, Offb.), desto mehr treten dann auch bei den geläutersten Subjekten (z. B. Joh.) Formen der Inspiration auf, wobei das subjektive wache Seelenleben zurücktritt. Als Resultat, schließt man dann, und dies mit Recht, ist überall dies, daß die Bibel durch und durch **Gottes Wort** und durch und durch auch **echt menschliches Wort** ist.

Wenn ich diesem Resultat zustimme und die Ausführungen namhafter Dogmatiker mir im großen und ganzen zu eigen mache, so werde ich wohl vielfachen Widerspruch erfahren, namentlich sei-

tens **moderner Bibelkritiker.** Doch was will das sagen: moderner Bibelkritiker! Wenn ich die im Grund doch auch noch recht auseinandergehenden Resultate ihrer Kritik mit den Resultaten früherer vergleiche, so vermag ich kaum etwas Neues zu entdecken. Alles schon dagewesen! Aber die Frage, Lebensfrage ist: Ist die Bibel Gottes Wort, die ganze Bibel, oder nicht? Wie können wir dem gläubigen Volk die Bibel als Gottes Wort empfehlen, das Lesen der Bibel, das tägliche Lesen, dringend empfehlen, wenn „man" nur gewisse Teile derselben als inspiriert anerkennen will? Wenn „man" der Naturwissenschaft zulieb bedenkliche Konzessionen macht? Zumal es doch feststeht, daß zwischen einer gläubigen Naturforschung, ich kann auch sagen, einer objektiven, voraussetzungslosen Naturforschung und den Lehren der Bibel kein Zwiespalt faktisch besteht.

Betrachten wir nun die **Lehrmeinungen der hervorragenden Theologen über die Inspiration.**

Einmütig lehren die „Kirchenväter" und ältesten Lehrer der Kirche, daß die biblischen Schriftsteller unter Eingebung des Heiligen Geistes ihre Bücher niedergeschrieben haben, nehmen aber auch verschiedene Grade der Inspiration an. Die Kirche des Mittelalters stellte über die Inspiration keine besondern Bestimmungen auf. Die Bibel war ja von minderer Bedeutung als die Lehren der „**Tradition,**" Aussprüche der Päpste und Konzilien. Aber ein Abälard fand sogar Irrtümer bei Propheten und Aposteln, und Erasmus sagt: „Nur Christus war von Irrtum frei; es wankt nicht sogleich die Autorität der Heiligen Schrift, wenn Schriftsteller in Worten oder im Sinn auseinandergehen, wenn nur die Summe dessen feststeht, worauf unser Heil ruht."

Für **Zwingli und Kalvin** steht die göttliche Inspiration der Bibel als selbstverständlich fest, ohne daß sich bei ihnen ein geflissentliches Nachdenken über Art und Umfang derselben fände. „Jedenfalls schließt die Inspiration nach Kalvin nicht die Freiheit schriftstellerischer Bewegung der heiligen Autoren aus; er urteilt unbefangen über die äußere Seite der Schrift." (Müller Sym.) Ueber kleine Widersprüche in den Evangelien geht er mehrfach mit einem „parum interest" hinweg. Zwingli zieht gelegentlich die „Offenbarung" in Zweifel, scheint aber kein fertiges Urteil aussprechen zu wollen. Kalvin hat zwar unter allen neutestamentlichen Büchern die Apokalypse nicht kommentiert, aber in seiner „Institutio" sie öfter als kanonisch zitiert. Bei **Luther** hingegen finden sich stark herabsetzende Urteile über einige Bücher der Bibel, obschon er doch die Heilige Schrift als alleinige Quelle des christlichen Glaubens gelehrt und verteidigt hat. So sagt er von den **Propheten,** daß sie Moses und ihre Vorgänger studiert und nicht immer Gold

und Silber, sondern auch Heu und Stroh und Holz darauf gebaut haben. Das Buch **Esther** hielt er des Kanons unwürdig. In den **Episteln der Apostel** findet er manches Menschliche. Wie er über den **Jakobusbrief** urteilte, ist zu bekannt, um hier wiederholt zu werden. Aber Luther war ja doch nicht unfehlbar, wollte es auch nicht sein, und über diese und andre abfällige Urteile über biblische Bücher sind seine Anhänger schon längst hinweggegangen. Die **altprotestantische Lehre** von der Inspiration lautet wie folgt: die göttliche Eingebung ist ein solcher Akt, vermöge dessen nicht nur die der Wirklichkeit entsprechende Fassung der aufzuzeichnenden Dinge, sondern auch die Fassung der **Worte selbst** und alles dessen, wodurch jene ausgedrückt werden sollte, auf übernatürliche Weise dem Verstand der Schreibenden mitgeteilt und der Willen derselben zum Akt des Schreibens angeregt würde. Die Propheten und Apostel fungierten nur als Sekretäre des diktierenden Heiligen Geistes. Derselbe gab den Antrieb und Auftrag zu schreiben. Alles und jegliches ist nicht nur auf Grund unfehlbarer Assistenz und Leitung Gottes aufgezeichnet, sondern besondrer Zuführung und Eingebung, sowie besonderm Diktate des Heiligen Geistes zuzuschreiben; sogar sämtliche und speziell alle einzelnen Worte und Laute hat der Heilige Geist den Schriftstellern geliefert. — Aber die Verschiedenheit des Stils der einzelnen Schriftsteller! Dieselbe erklärte man naiv genug aus der Verschiedenheit der in den einzelnen Büchern behandelten Gegenstände.

Die Uebertreibungen der protestantisch-scholastischen Periode mußten, nachdem sie ihren Gipfelpunkt erreicht hatten, allmählich einer **gemäßigteren Ansicht** Platz machen. „Die Wissenschaft wies allmählich nach, daß der Text der Bibel im Lauf der Zeit Aenderungen erlitten habe. Die biblische Philologie stellte das Individuelle und Zeitgeschichtliche der Sprache und des Stils der biblischen Bücher ins Licht, und die menschliche Seite der biblischen Urkunden trat mit derselben Gewalt nach und nach in den Vordergrund, mit der sie bisher zurückgedrängt worden war." Sogar die konservativsten Theologen (vgl. Stier, Hengstenberg und die ihm folgenden Theologen) machten der Kritik Zugeständnisse, behaupteten nicht mehr die Irrtumslosigkeit der Bibel in den für das Heil gleichgültigen Dingen und redeten sogar von Graden der Inspiration und warfen der früheren Orthodoxie vor, „daß sie den Unterschied zwischen Wortinspiration und Wörterinspiration nicht gehörig erkannt und die Heilige Schrift mehr als das Produkt eines äußerlichen göttlichen Diktats, denn einer innerlichen göttlichen Eingeistung betrachtet haben." (Philippi, Glaubensl. I, S. 100.)

So schien die Theorie der **Verbalinspiration** abgetan zu sein; aber sie hat bis heute ihre hartnäckigen Vertreter in orthodox

lutherischen Kreisen, welche den besondern Wert und die Bedeutung der Bibel nur in der Verbalinspiration begründet glauben. Gegen dieselbe spricht vor allem die Tatsache, daß die Bibel selbst sich nicht für wörtlich inspiriert ausgibt. Man hat zwar hingewiesen auf einige Stellen des Alten Testaments, z. B. Ex. 4, 12 und 34, 27, Deutr. 31, 19, II. Sam. 23, 2, Jes. 1, 2; 8, 1, Jer. 1, 9; 36, 2. Aber aus diesen Stellen folgt nur, daß sie selbst als Wort Gottes bezeichnet werden, hingegen nicht, daß das **ganze** Alte Testament im strengen Sinn **wörtlich** inspiriert sei. „Das Alte Testament bezeichnet nichts von dem, was es enthält, als Wort Gottes außer dem Gesetz und den Prophezeiungen. Das übrige Lehrhafte und Geschichtliche wird von den alttestamentlichen Schriftstellern einfach als solches gegeben, ohne die leiseste Andeutung, daß sie die Kenntnis davon bis auf die Worte durch göttliche Offenbarung empfangen hätten, zum Teil vielmehr sogar mit ausdrücklicher Angabe anderweitiger **Quellen,** aus denen sie geschöpft haben." Dies schließt aber die **göttliche Assistenz** nicht aus, die die Schriftsteller vor Irrtum bewahrte. Nun hat man behauptet, das Neue Testament deute auf die **wörtliche** Inspiration des Alten Testaments hin und hat Stellen angeführt, wie Matth. 1, 22; 2, 15; Apg. 1, 16; 4, 25; Röm. 3, 2; 2. Petri 1, 21; Hebr. 10, 15 u. a. m.; diese Stellen reichten hin, zu beweisen, daß das Neue Testament sämtliche alttestamentliche Bundesschriften bis **ins Einzelnste** hinein als inspiriert, als inspiriertes Gotteswort betrachte. Aber in allen jenen neutestamentlichen Stellen ist nur von prophetischen Aussprüchen die Rede, oder aber nur gemeint, „daß die betreffenden Stellen wenigstens mittelbar Produkte heiliger, göttlicher **Begeisterung** seien," was zweifelsohne etwas anders ist als **Wortinspiration.** Man könnte eher die Stelle 2. Tim. 3, 16 anführen. Aber auch diese beweist nicht, daß das ganze Alte Testament wörtlich inspiriert ist. Paulus verweist in derselben den Timotheus auf die heiligen Schriften als solche, die imstand seien, zur Seligkeit weise zu machen und gibt als Grund dafür an ihre Theopneustie, daß sie von Gott eingegeben seien. Ueber den Charakter dieser Inspiration ist nichts gesagt. Nun wird in Matth. 5, 18 und Luk. 16, 17 von Christus gesagt: bis daß Himmel und Erde vergehet, wird kein Jota oder Strichlein vom Gesetz vergehen, bis das alles geschieht. Dies kann wohl aber nicht von dem kleinsten Teil des **Gesetzbuches,** sondern nur als Bezeichnung des **Gesetzes selbst** verstanden werden.

Was das Neue Testament betrifft, so beruft man sich zum Beweise der Verbalinspiration auf Luk. 21, 33; diese Stelle bezieht sich indessen gar nicht auf eine Schrift, sondern auf die von Christus soeben **gesprochenen Weissagungen.** „Alle übrigen Stellen, die man angeführt hat, besagen nichts weiter, als daß Christus

seiner Kirche den Heiligen Geist gegeben, welcher je nach Bedürfnis derselben und nach Maßgabe der ihren einzelnen Gliedern zukommenden Aufgabe sich wirksam zeigt." Endlich hat man geltend gemacht, Inhalt und Form ließen sich nicht kommen, wo also Gedanken der Bibel inspiriert seien, müßten auch die betreffenden Worte auf Inspiration zurückgeführt werden. Wenn nun eine **Realinspiration** der heiligen Schriften feststeht, so ist jener Einwand doch eine Uebertreibung. Richtig ist, daß jede Veränderung des Ausdrucks auch die Fassung des Gedankens modifiziert, oder, wenn nicht den Gedanken selbst, doch den begleitenden Empfindungs- oder Stimmungsgehalt. „Und man mag die Worte der Heiligen Schrift mit noch so großer Pietät betrachten, nur in seltenen Fällen, Ausnahmefällen, wird man sagen können: Dieser Gedanke oder diese Empfindung konnte nur genau so („verbatenus") ausgedrückt werden, wenn eine bestimmte Wirkung erfolgen sollte." Die verschiedenen Schriftsteller selber drücken ja hin und wieder ungefähr denselben Gedanken verschiedentlich aus. — Ja, konsequenterweise müßten unter Annahme der Verbalinspiration auch die Uebersetzer der Bibel, ein Hieronymus und Luther und herab bis zu den Uebersetzern in die moderne englische Sprache inspiriert gewesen sein.

Mit Recht ist allgemein die Verbalinspiration aufgegeben. Dagegen läßt sich eine durchgreifende oder partiale **Realinspiration** wohl verteidigen. Nach Aufgabe der Verbalinspiration kam man zu der Lehre, daß **Inhalt** der Bibel unmittelbar auf göttlicher Eingebung beruhe, entweder so, daß der **Gesamtinhalt** dadurch gedeckt werden soll, oder so, daß nur die **eigentliche Offenbarung** und das **Heil betreffenden Nachrichten und Gedanken** auf Inspiration zurückgeführt werden, oder so, daß zwischen den einzelnen Büchern und Bücherarten oder verschiedenen Materien unterschieden wird. Manche Lehrmeinungen bezüglich der Inspiration der Kürze wegen übergehend, bemerke ich nur, daß selbst ältere **Jesuiten** die Ansicht vertraten, daß nur die prophetischen Bücher der Bibel, nicht aber die geschichtlichen und übrigen inspiriert seien. Die Katholiken hatten ein Interesse daran in Abrede zu stellen, daß die Bibel hinreichend sei (die „sufficientia"!), um ihre Lehre von der Tradition zu verteidigen. Der Jesuit **Bellarmin,** der sich des größten Ansehens erfreut, verfocht daher die Ansicht: „Im strengen Sinn habe Gott das zu Schreibende nur den Propheten geoffenbart; was dagegen die biblischen Geschichtschreiber anlange, so habe Gott diesen nur den Antrieb zum Schreiben gegeben und ihnen dabei Beistand geleistet, dagegen nicht alles inspiriert." — Und doch muß ich nach sorgfältigem Studium konstatieren, daß seither die historischen Forschungen und selbst die ausgegrabenen Tontafeln die geschichtlichen Nachrichten der Bibel nicht als irrisch oder falsch darstellen. Die Schreiber

dieser Nachrichten hatten also sehr gute Quellen zur Verfügung, wo sie nicht Selbsterlebtes niederschrieben. Und warum sollte man ihnen den „göttlichen Beistand" verweigern?

Schleiermacher, eine Autorität, vertritt wenigstens hinsichtlich des Neuen Testaments die Ansicht, daß nicht speziell, wenigstens nicht unmittelbar die Schriften der Bibel als inspiriert gelten, wohl aber den Urhebern derselben eine habituelle besondre Erleuchtung zukomme, welche wie alle ihre Funktionen im Dienst ihres Berufes, des Evangeliums, so auch ihre in demselben verfaßten Schriften beeinflußt habe, sei es eine solche Erleuchtung, daß dadurch eine **relative** (das Wesentliche betreffende) Irrtumslosigkeit der Heiligen Schrift sich ergeben mußte, sei es eine solche, daß die biblischen Schriftsteller infolge derselben und ihres Zeugenberufes trotz individueller Sündigkeit in der Ausübung ihrer mündlichen und schriftlichen Lehrtätigkeit auch als Einzelne und im Einzelnen **unbedingte** Unfehlbarkeit besessen haben müssen. Schleiermacher erklärt dies so: „Die einzelnen Bücher des Neuen Testaments sind von dem Heiligen Geist eingegeben, und die Sammlung derselben ist unter der Leitung des Heiligen Geistes entstanden." Gehen wir auf den Begriff des Heiligen Geistes als Gemeingeist der christlichen Kirche zurück, daher auch als Quelle aller Geistesgaben und guten Werke, so ist auch alle **Gedankenerzeugung,** sofern sie dem Reich Gottes angehört, auf ihn zurückzuführen und also von ihm **eingegeben.** Nach ihm war also die Inspiration **kein vorübergehender Zustand,** sondern eine **dauernde** Eigenschaft der Apostel. Die eigentümliche apostolische Eingebung, sagt er, ist nicht etwas den neutestamentlichen **Büchern** ausschließlich Zukommendes, sondern diese **partizipieren nur daran.** — Nach **R. Rothe** ist die Inspiration nur ein **„momentaner** Zustand," „ein flüchtig dahineilender Zustand, der allemal in irgendeinem Maß ein ekstatischer sei." Neuere Dogmatiker (z. B. Nitzsch) lehren, daß **Realinspiration** der Bibel im Allgemeinen nur insoweit sich behaupten lasse, als dieselbe mit der **Personalinspiration** zusammenhängt, hingegen nicht in konkreto für alle Akte und Momente des Schreibens. Ein Eingegebensein des sämtlichen Schriftinhalts lasse sich schon deshalb nicht behaupten, weil, wie heute fast allgemein anerkannt sei (!!!), neben dem Allerbedeutungsvollsten sich hie und da Gleichgiltiges und Bedeutungsloses darin finde, das aus göttlicher Eingebung abzuleiten, ein Verstoß gegen den Satz von der Oekonomie Gottes wäre, derzufolge er niemals da besonders und unmittelbar eingreift, wo die „causae secundae" vollkommen ausreichen. Sodann weist man hin, daß nicht wenige einzelne Bibelstellen andern widersprächen z. B. die Vorgeschichte bei Matthäus und Lukas, die Berichte über den Todestag Christi bei den Synoptikern und bei Johannes, und es gäbe

in den beiden Testamenten sagenhafte Bestandteile. Von letzteren seien zu unterscheiden die mythischen, deren es auch in beiden Testamenten gäbe.

Nun aber frage ich, was bleibt denn von der Bibel übrig, wenn als Menschenwort, Mythe, Sage, Widersprechendes, Geschichtliches, Naturwissenschaftliches, Geographisches weggestrichen wird? Was läßt Rothe übrig, wenn er alles „was einfache Geschichtserzählung ist," sowie alles, was „irgendwie wissenschaftlicher Natur und Ergebnis der Reflexion," oder „Lehrentwicklung" ist, von der Infallibilität ausschließt und bindendes Ansehen nur dem zugesteht, was „die unmittelbare Heilsverkündigung" ist, „insbesondre dem Inhalt des Evangeliums selbst," von welchem Inhalt jedoch z. B. die Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu ausgeschlossen sein soll. Da nun auch „die Christologie der Synoptiker eine andre ist, als die des Johannes," so fragt man billig, was dann am Ende als „unmittelbarer Inhalt des Evangeliums selbst" nach Abzug alles Geschichtlichen und aller Lehrentwicklung bleibt. Zudem stimmen diese Kritiker in dem, was sie nicht als inspiriert, als Wort Gottes, bezeichnen, gar nicht überein. Willkür, Voreingenommenheit scheint obzuwalten. Und Widersprüche! So oft schon haben die bedeutendsten Schriftausleger dargetan, daß es keine Widersprüche in der Bibel gibt und daß das, was man als solche bezeichnet, nichts andres ist, als verschiedene Ausdrucksweise, Erweiterungen oder Einschränkungen. Die **Einheit der Evangelien** steht festbegründet. Was Verschiedenes (nicht Widersprechendes!) sich findet, beweist eben, wie schon erwähnt, daß der Einfluß des Heiligen Geistes über die biblischen Schriftsteller deren Individualität nicht aufhob oder minderte, daß sie geschrieben haben als der Lukas oder Markus oder Johannes, oder Paulus und Petrus unter dem inspirierenden Beistand des Geistes Gottes, des Geistes der Wahrheit, welchen Jesus ihnen verheißen hat und der bei ihnen bleiben soll.

Die Heilige Schrift enthält für uns evangelische Pastoren Gottes Wort und auf ihr, nicht auf Lehren der Dogmatiker, mögen sie ältere oder neuere sein, beruht unser heiliger evangelischer Christenglaube. Darum:

„Das Wort sie sollen lassen stahn
Und kein'n Dank dazu haben
Er ist bei uns wohl auf dem Plan
Mit seinem Geist und Gaben."

EDITORIALS

PROSPECTUS FOR 1932

Rev. G. Nussmann writes on the *Office of the Keys* and on *Modern Conceptions of God.*

Rev. H. J. Schick, D.D., on *Immortality.*

Rev. C. Loos on the *Prayer Life of the Christian.*

Professor J. Biegeleisen on the *Prologue of the Fourth Gospel.*

Rev. J. Otto Reller on *Creative Preaching.*

Rev. H. E. Koenig on *Christian Missions among Low-Caste Hindus.*

Rev. A. J. Munsterman on the *Modern Interpretation of the Miracles of Jesus* and on the *Reward of the Righteous in Jewish Literature of Jesus' Day.*

Für die deutsche Abteilung können wir bis jetzt die folgenden Aufsätze ankündigen:

Herr **Professor R. H. Grützmacher** liefert sechs Nummern: 1. **Spiritismus und Okkultismus.** 2. **„Christian Science."** 3. **Mazdazdan.** 4. **Theosophie.** 5. **Anthroposophie und Christusgemeinschaft.** 6. **Krishnamurti.**

Dr. C. Schieler schreibt über **die Autorität der Bibel** und über **die Barthsche Theologie.**

G. F. Schütze über die **Wunder der Bibel** und über **Autoritätsglaube oder Erlebnis?**

Dr. D. Irion über **R. Kittels Psalmenkommentar.**

E. Schweizer über **Paulus und die Heidenkirche.**

FAITH AS A WORLD FORCE

We have in our city (Cleveland) a "Community Religious Hour." It was started by a group of citizens of Protestant, Jewish and Catholic faiths, and its purpose is to emphasize the spiritual values of human life, to stress the fatherhood of God as the basis of mutual understanding and good will, and to promote the moral and religious welfare of the community. A number of recognized leaders of religious thought in America have been brought, or are going to be brought, to Cleveland to make their contribution to this undertaking, such as Shailer Mathews, Sherwood Eddy, Henry N.

Wieman, Kirtley F. Mather, Charles W. Gilkey; Rabbis A. U. Silver, Stephen S. Wise, Louis Wolsey (of Philadelphia); Father Jones I. Carrigan, bishop Joseph C. Schrembs (of the Cleveland diocese).

The last one we heard was *Charles E. Jefferson,* the outgoing pastor of Broadway Tabernacle, New York. We expected much from the man who has just ended such a marvelous ministry at that church and has also endeared himself to thousands by his books on biblical characters (Paul, Jeremiah, Isaiah)—and we were not disappointed. Jefferson has aged considerably since we saw him last, and he seemed tired, but as soon as he began to speak he cast a spell over his audience. His subject was "Faith as a World Force" and he based his thought on Hebrews 11: 1, the well known definition of faith, the only one of its kind in the Bible.

He launched out at once into an inspiring exposition of that chapter. We were well aware that he, if any one, knew how to make the scriptures speak, but we had never heard such exegesis before. To say that we were at once captivated by the magic of his inimitable manner, is only the literal truth.

He said the eleventh of Hebrews is written in "the great style." Think of that phrase in the 27th verse, where it is said of Moses "for he endured, as seeing him who is invisible." Jefferson spoke these words with an intonation which sent a thrill through his hearers. They felt the depth and beauty underlying them even before he had enlarged upon it. Then he took up verses 33-37, containing a description of the sufferings of the martyrs and their heroic fortitude. We can't give his ipsissima verba, but there could be no doubt that after hearing him these passages had burned their way into our hearts and imaginations.

The speaker said, this chapter is not only great in style but also in the sweep of its thought. It includes Israelites and non-Israelites, prophets and patriarchs; people of whom we know much and others of whom we know hardly anything; great and spiritual men and men not spiritual at all, like Samson and Rahab, the harlot. It is great in its conception of faith. In expounding the definition of faith given in the first verse, he aimed to bring out the practical, creative nature of faith. Faith is not an opinion, it is *"building on the invisible to accomplish the impossible."* The writer of Hebrews, he said, after giving his definition, seems to be saying, "now forget my definition and I will show you faith in action," and then he takes us into the religious "Hall of Fame," showing that every one here perpetuated owes his admission to the same spiritual attitude.

But faith is not only indispensable in the religious sphere. Our great explorers all had it, our merchant princes, our railroad builders. And is not science building on the invisible? Has any one ever seen an atom, or an electron, or wireless waves, or ether? Still they all believe in these things and others of like nature and achieve great results. Go into the laboratories of medical research. For a long time they have been trying to find the cause of cancer in order to find a cure for it. They haven't succeeded yet, but are they willing to give up? No, they continue—and they will find a cure, as they have for other great scourges of the human race. Explorers have attempted to plant their foot upon every square foot of the globe. It took them a long time to reach the Northpole; but they got there at last. And then they conquered the Southpole as well. How about the reformers? Alcohol is the great enemy of man. Many methods to combat it have been tried. None of them is wholly successful, but are we willing to give up? The same applies to the problem of war. Some have said, and are saying today, we'll always have war, man is a fighting animal. Does that silence the pacifist? No. Or the union of all Christian churches. The speaker said, he believed all Protestant churches would unite ultimately. Are we going to draw the line there? No, as Christians we can't but believe that in the end there will be one flock under one shepherd.

Then he reached his climax in the first verses of the 12th chapter: Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of (not, "our") faith, "the pioneer and the perfection of faith" (Moffatt's translation). Jesus, he said, had a marvelously great conception of faith. When he spoke of faith he would speak in terms of exaggeration: "If you have faith as a mustard seed, speak to this mountain . . ." When he found it in others his heart would thrill, "O woman, thy faith is great," or, "Verily, I have not found such faith, not in Israel." More than this, he exhibited the power of faith in his own life. It was the pole star of his career from the moment he found his father in the temple to his last triumphant word on the cross: "It is finished. . . . hands."

It was an unforgettable hour as we thus sat at the feet of the aged "Saint of Broadway" and heard him discourse on the main spring of the Christian life and spiritual power. "If we could expound the scriptures like that," we heard one of the Reformed brethren say rapturously. Yes, but every one felt that Jefferson himself could not have spoken like that if he had not lived by faith all these years.

THE MERGER

Yesterday (Jan. 5th) our Evangelical Ministers' Circle (of Cleveland, O.) was invited to a luncheon at the Y. M. C. A., by the Reformed ministers' group of the city. The intention was to cement the bonds of fellowship between the two local bodies still further and, more particularly, to discuss the latest developments in our merger movement. There were two speakers on either side. This writer had been asked to review the historical steps leading up to the negotiations of the last few years. He dwelt especially on the different relations to the secular state held by the Lutheran and the Reformed churches. The Lutherans leaned on the state, making the princes the summi episcopï of the church; and thereby succeeded in keeping the whole population together in "Landeskirchen," whose boundaries were coterminous with the states. The Reformed insisted on independence from the state, a valuable feature indeed, but such freedom from state interference resulted also in a multiplicity of sects, so that today, on the Calvinistic soil of this country, we have over 200 denominations. We then sketched the modern movement for union of the churches, particularly in the three bodies with which we are concerned. 1929 was the year that raised our hopes high. The General Conference at Rochester adopted the basis of union unanimously.

1930 was not so favorable, viewing developments from the side of the Evangelical Synod. In the fall we were informed (by the "Ohio Christian News") that the Reformed Church had abandoned negotiations with the United Brethren Church as futile and impracticable and would now go on with its merger work with the Evangelical Synod only. Strange to say, in the same number of the "Christian News" Bishop Clippinger of the United Brethren Church declared that the plans of union had been adopted by all their conferences from coast to coast. See our German editorial in the January issue.

It was pointed out at this luncheon that such an acceptance by conferences meant little in the United Brethren Church, since it was the individual congregations which were the final authority and not the conferences. Moreover we were told that the United Brethren Church would probably prefer to unite with the Evangelical Church (Association, formerly), whose church government was more congenial to theirs. Incidentally we learned that the "Stationing Committee," which had gotten into the "Basis of Union" through the United Brethren Church, was objectionable to the Reformed. Still, a development of far greater importance had entered into the whole situation in the course of the past year. It was the

general movement in Presbyterian and Reformed churches towards an alliance of all Reformed churches holding the Presbyterian system. The Reformed Church in the United States had sent representatives to various meetings held in 1930 for this purpose, and at a final meeting at Pittsburgh, their commission had agreed to the proposed merger plan with the Presbyterians, and promised to submit it to their classes at their spring meetings. At a joint meeting of Reformed and Evangelical Commission members, which took place also at Pittsburgh on Dec. 18, 1930, Dr. Richards, of Lancaster, Pa., sought to ascertain the attitude of our representation concerning that larger merger. Our men replied that while entertaining the most friendly feelings toward all the bodies interested in the project, they had no authority to commit themselves or their Synod toward any pending or future negotiations (See Ev. Herald, Jan. 8, 1931). The following day Dr. Richards read a statement from the Reformed commissioners that they did not consider it expedient or practicable under the present circumstances to continue further negotiations for union with the Commission of the Evangelical Synod. Thereupon our Commission stated they concurred in the adjournment of their negotiations and expressed the hope that the future might bring the two churches together again.

Now these last steps were apparently not known to all of our Reformed brethren who were our hosts at the January luncheon. At any rate, on the motion of Dr. Heyl of the "Reformierte Kirchenzeitung," a resolution was passed that whatever might be the result of that Reformed-Presbyterian project, it should not form an impediment to the union of the Reformed Church and the Evangelical Synod. (Under the circumstances the resolution could not be anything but a friendly gesture.)

It was stated by the writer at the luncheon, that we could not blame the Reformed for accepting the hands stretched out to them on the part of friendly and kindred churches. Nevertheless, we feel constrained to say here that the fact that we started out with such hopes, that our Commission worked so faithfully and our Synod reacted with such unanimity, only to see the United Brethren Church drifting towards the Evangelical Association and the Reformed seeking union with the Presbyterian, this fact is disheartening and almost humiliating. It was well enough for our Commissioners to say that they "had enjoyed the happy and Christian associations with the Reformed." But still our sympathy goes out to them as they were going on their homeward way depressed by the feeling that they were coming back to their brethren with empty hands.

Wissenschaft und Glaube.

Es ist Tatsache, was wir einst den Schotten Marcus Dods aussprechen hörten, daß es nur eine Wahrheit gebe, und daß deshalb Wissenschaft und Glaube im Grund übereinstimmen müßten. Sie suchen beide und wollen beide nur in den Besitz der Wahrheit kommen, also können sie keine feindlichen Brüder sein. Oft genug aber scheint es, als wenn die verwandtschaftlichen Gefühle zwischen beiden nicht besonders herzlich seien. Es gab eine Zeit, wo die Wissenschaft nur als dienende Magd des Glaubens und der Theologie angesehen wurde. Aber diese Zeit ist längst vorbei. Die Wissenschaft hat sich von Theologie und Kirche emanzipiert und ist selbst zur Herrin und Königin geworden. Es hat einen langen Kampf gekostet. Theologie und Kirche haben Jahrhunderte lang sich den Ansprüchen der Wissenschaft entgegen geworfen. In diesem Kampf ist die Theologie unterlegen. Triumphierend weisen die Wissenschaftler auf die glänzenden Erfolge ihres Freiheitskrieges hin. Man denke an Andrew White und seine „History of the Warfare between Theology and Science." Er zeigt, daß jedem Vorstoß der Wissenschaft Theologie und Kirche erst die bitterste Feindschaft entgegengesetzt hätten, um dann nachher doch klein beizugeben und die Richtigkeit der wissenschaftlichen Ansprüche stillschweigend anzuerkennen. Natürlich ist der Gesamteindruck des Buches eine völlige Diskreditierung der Kirche und ihrer theologischen Führer.

Als eine Folge dieser Sachlage nehmen wir heute bei vielen Theologen eine Erschütterung ihres Glaubensstandes wahr. Sie sagen uns, absolute Gewißheit in religiösen Dingen sei ausgeschlossen, man müsse sich mit der Wahrscheinlichkeit zufrieden geben. Andre gehen noch weiter, sie halten die Religion für ein bloßes Produkt der menschlichen Entwicklung, es liege ihr keine reale Gottesexistenz zugrunde. Wir weisen z. B. auf das Buch (soeben erschienen) des Chicagoer Professors (für allgemeine Religionsvergleichung) Dr. A. Eustace Haydon, „the Quest of the Ages," hin. Der ewig lange Drang des Menschengeschlechtes, so sagt er, ging aus auf Leben, volles Leben. Die Hauptbedürfnisse dazu waren Nahrung, Geschlechtstrieb und Obdach. Zur Befriedigung dieser Bedürfnisse brauchte er neben eigener Arbeit der Naturkräfte. Er fühlte sich von ihnen abhängig und suchte ihre Gunst und Gaben durch allerhand Zeremonien der Verehrung. Seine ersten Gottheiten waren Naturgötter. Mit dem Fortschritt seiner Entwicklung kam nicht nur ein größerer Reichtum seiner äußeren Lage, sondern er fand auch eine höhere Kultur, geistige und sittliche Werte, Freundlichkeit, Gerechtigkeit, Gesetze, Kunst, Lebensfreude. Beinah zur gleichen Zeit wurde vierlerorts ein Ideal der menschlichen Gesellschaft entdeckt (Reich Gottes), aber es fehlte an der Kraft es zu ver-

wirklichen. So verlegte denn der Mensch die Realisierung desselben in das Jenseits. Er legte seine Last, sein Verlangen, seine Hoffnung in den Schoß der Götter, aber die Götter halfen natürlich nicht. Wir, heute, sind soweit vorgedrungen in der Kenntnis der Natur und des Menschen, daß wir imstande sein sollten, das alte Ideal auf dieser Erde in Tat und Leben umzusetzen.

Dr. Haydon wurde auf einem „Forum" gefragt, ob man denn nun der Götter nicht mehr bedürfe. Er sagte nicht gerade nein, aber das war seine eigentliche Meinung. Das „Universum" würde auf ihrer Seite sein, so tröstete er seine Zuhörer. Auf die Frage, ob er an Fortdauer nach dem Tod glaube, antwortete er, daß er für seine Person diesen Glauben nicht habe.

So weit nun wie Haydon gehen nicht alle. Aber die modernen Gottesbegriffe, die sie uns darbieten (Wieman u. a.) sind durchaus unbefriedigend. Hier kann uns die Wissenschaft nichts geben. Trotz ihres Siegesmarsches gegen viele Außenpositionen des Glaubens kann sie uns den Gottesglauben nicht nehmen, noch kann sie ihn uns geben. Er wächst auf dem Boden des Menschenherzens und kann zu seiner Pflege und Stärkung des Gotteswortes und der Erfahrungen des Gottesvolkes nicht entbehren.

The Christian World

Honoring Sherwood Eddy

Even New York seems to have been surprised at the size of the throng that turned out for the dinner which marked the completion of Sherwood Eddy's career of active service with the Y. M. C. A. There have been times when some leaders of the "Y" have laid themselves open to the suspicion of wishing that Sherwood Eddy would betake himself out of their movement, quickly and completely. But when the day came that, by the operation of inexhorable "Y" law, Mr. Eddy had to retire, the outburst of admiration and affection was perhaps the largest and most spontaneous that organization has ever known. The tribute to Mr. Eddy reached its climax in the testimonial dinner given in the ballroom of one of New York's largest hotels on January 27. Every single seat that could be crowded into the immense space was filled. And Mr. Eddy's great associate in these years of his "Y" leadership—the man who has stood rock-like behind him when the storm of criticism has been heaviest—Dr. John R. Mott, surpassed in sweep and power his own reputation as a speaker. Dr. Mott divided Mr. Eddy's life into three periods, each of thirty years. Two of these periods now are past; the third is just opening. And this third, he prophesied, will be the most significant. Mr. Eddy, so our correspondents inform us, was obviously unprepared for the sincerity and volume of the approval which was heaped upon him. But there was no mystery about it. There have been plenty of men to oppose him, and there will be more in days to come. But nobody can come into touch with him without recognizing his transparent and all-possessing honesty. Honest men are rare enough so that when one is found he is worth cherishing. That is why the retirement of Sherwood Eddy has proved for the "Y" a rarely moving experience.—*Christian Century.*

Prophetic India

DEVERE ALLEN

From the olden walls of St. James's Palace, King Charles the First was led forth to his trial, and, later, to his execution. Like many another traveler, I have stood on the spot where Charles received his death sentence in Westminster Hall; and, more fortunate than some, perhaps, I have seen the actual death warrant signed by Cromwell and a long list of judges who, after all, were only Cromwell. All this is vivid history.

And somehow, as I contemplate the proceedings now going on at the same tradition-haunted place, the one scene mingles curiously with the other. At the oval table which is euphemistically labeled "round," surrounded by bright red wall paper and heavy curtains, sit a small group of Englishmen and nearly sixty Indians. These last are there to speak for India, but in effect they have been chosen by the ruling power, Britain. Every one of them knows that at home he is on trial. There is no threat of the executioner's block save in a political and social sense. Their judge will be the great section of the

Indian people who refuse to take them seriously, and who will judge them by the standard of a slight man now imprisoned in Yerovda jail. Whatever may be the outcome of the present deliberations, even if it be a constitution for a federated India, it will be devoid of life unless it meets the desires of the Indian National Congress, the only body which has any substantial claim to represent majority opinion among the articulate masses of India. As the conservative editor of the *Observer*, Mr. J. L. Garv n, recently put it, "Any one is a zany who supposes that the extremist forces not represented at the Round Table are going to be reduced to a pacific cipher by anything which may be recommended, "We are all here together," but over in India are the men beginning. "We are all here together," but over in India are the men and woman his Government has thought it necessary to put behind the bars, and it is only they, and their tremendous following, who at long last will decide the issue. They may decide it by weakening in their solidarity or in their demands, or by their ultimate clear victory. But the decision will not be made at St. James's Palace, in the House of Commons, or at 10 Downing Street.

Soon after these lines are read, if not before, a definite statement of Round Table progress will in all probability have been made by the Prime Minister. It may run to the effect that an agreement has been reached. It may reveal more fully what every one here knows—that basic conflicts of interest have proved almost immovable. It may use the fair language of a "strategic retreat" to foretell final disruption. Writing under conditions prevailing at the turn of the year, I should be inclined to hazard a guess that at this conference (which is like Hamlet with Hamlet left out) no far-reaching program of unity, based on freedom from British dominance, will be achieved; and anything less than freedom in dominion status is doomed in India itself. Yet if a failure to agree is the result, it will be explained by the press as largely due to Moslem-Hindu animosities; and there is unfortunately enough truth in this to make the deeper issues less readily discernible.

One must always hope; and it would be gratifying to believe that from this Conference might come forth a program for a free India. But it would be dishonorable, merely for the sake of appearing a more balanced reporter, to repeat in this article the official propaganda regarding the proceedings, a propaganda rendered indefensible in view of the strict censorship over Indian news.

It is only fair to say, however, that the Indian speakers have used plain language, demonstrating the unified demand of their country for freedom, and that they have been allowed to speak directly to the British people by means of the radio, as guests of the British Broadcasting Corporation, the government monopoly. All this has been highly educational to a public whose interest in India is cool if not distinctly lacking. But as a rule the speakers have prudently confined themselves to voicing Indian aspirations; they have not said very much about what is going on in India at the present time.

Nobody can understand the continued bitterness in India, or the insistence of the Indians here, without knowing how British policy,

which is not malicious but blundering and unimaginative, is daily driving a deep wedge between the rulers and the ruled. And despite the censorship, discounting the spread of rumor and falsehood, there is plenty of information of reliable character here available.

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, one of the conferrees, said upon his arrival in London that "a loss of faith in the intention of England is the outstanding feature of Indian political life." A year ago the Viceroy stated definitely that it was "implicit in the declaration of 1917 that the natural issue of Indian constitutional progress . . . . . is the attainment of dominion status." Indians, the Round Table Conference notwithstanding, simply do not believe this to be the intent of Britain, irrespective of which party is in office.

If any one is inclined to accept the superficial quiet of the censored press as a reflection of the real India, let him ponder the speech of the Governor of the Punjab, made Oct. 25—a fairly recent date in view of the slowness with which news is coming through. He ought to know, for news has just reached London of his attempted assassination by a violent young man listed as an anarchist. It is no sign of agreement with the tatics outlined to claim for this quotation that it shows the state of popular feeling:

> The campaign has not only been continuous but has been also widespread. Not a single district in the province has escaped its operations at one time or another; and even remote tracts, which had hitherto remained untouched by movements of this nature, have had the usually tranquil surface of their daily life ruffled by the breeze of agitation. Also there is no form which the movement has taken in other parts of India which has not been tried here. Intensive excitation by meetings, speeches and processions, pamphleteering, enrollment of volunteers, breaches of the salt law, breaches of the forest law, refusal to pay rent, refusal to pay municipal taxes, refusal to pay land revenue and water rates, picketing of cloth, liquor and other shops, boycott and molestation of Government service and the supporters of Government, insult and vilification of the police, efforts to subvert military and police from their loyalty, attempts to close schools and colleges, resistance to arrest and the processes of the law, disobedience of prohibitory orders, marching by jatha through the countryside with unlawful purpose—with all these manifestations unfortunately during past months we have been only too familiar. Women and boys have been freely used as agents to add to difficulties.

A British journalist of high repute, traveling in India, states that the liquor boycott proceeds on an enormous scale. "Everywhere the silent pickets, mostly women, sit with their placards in front of the shops, and some, in the unspeakable filth of the slums, even watch the back doors. Drinking has diminished by more than a half, and licenses are sold at half the former figure."

The answer to the determined volunteers has been the use of bullets very rarely, but universally the *lathi* charge. The Bombay Medical Union recently found that, of all injuries from *lathi* charges

during the preceding six months, the percentage of head injuries had greatly increased, indicating the mounting ferocity of the police.

Miss Slade, daughter of Admiral Slade, and a student in Gandhi's *ashram*, recently toured through the region of Bardoli. This was once, a few years ago, the scene of a highly successful civil disobedience crusade, conspicuously non-violent. Lately it has been causing especial concern to the British *raj*. Here she actually found, at Kaira, a condition which needs to be reported. She writes to the British *New Leader:*

It was like a wild nightmare. I was in a zoological garden. There were the cages in a line looking on to a shallow veranda—cages in which one expected to see a couple of leopards or small bears. But no leopards or bears were there. No! They were the eyes of human beings that were peering through those bars. And not four eyes in the cage in front of us, but thirty-six—thirty-six heart-rending human eyes! For a moment I could not take it all in. I felt dumbfounded. Then as I looked I began to recognize old friends and acquaintances behind the bars. I pulled myself together and greeted them cheerily. But this wild nightmare was almost choking me. "Well, what a place you have got into this time! How big is it? Pace it out and let us see." One of them paced it out. About thirty-three feet by twenty-seven feet. "And you are eighteen?" "Yes, we are eighteen, and kept locked up in here all the twenty-four hours, except for forty minutes in the early morning, when we are taken out for latrine, bathing, and washing of clothes, and that we have to get through as fast as we can . . . ." With us was the mother of one of those who had been locked up there for over a month and a half.

One could go on with these tales for many a column. I have no stomach to do so. Atrocity stories, even when true, do not, in my judgment, constitute a potent service to the cause of peace or justice. One's mind leaps instantly to the various attempts on the lives of Englishmen, some of them successful. These killings, to be sure, have been disavowed by Gandhi and his fellow-leaders and they have been singularly few. What is equally true is the fact that the British people are not aware of the most revolting measures that have sometimes been used in their name; but what is far more disturbing is the obvious desire of the Government that the British people shall not know these things. Every least incident of brutality on the part of Indians is printed in the press of Britain; every least evidence of British brutality has to be ascertained surreptitiously, by circuitous routes. A little paper is now being published in London, entitled *Indian Events*, backed by a group of alert and responsible Englishmen. Its reports are documented, its tone is moderate, totally lacking in expressions of opinion. But its revelations are devastating.

It must not be forgotten that of the 26,000 nationalists admitted to be imprisoned, less than a thousand have even been charged with any violence. Mr. H. N. Brailsford, just before sailing for the United

States after a tour through India, wrote in the London *Nation and Athenaeum:* "In the villages, among which I passed five days, every scruple is forgotten, and in the areas which are resisting taxation, peasants are beaten indiscriminately for no discoverable offense, unless it be the wearing of the white Gandhi cap. In spite of all this immeasurable suffering, danger and loss, the Hindu population in the Bombay Presidency is all but solid for Congress." He further reports that "trade is at a standstill and credit scarcely exists."

Well indeed may those who are skeptical of nonviolence as a means of accomplishing social change, study the effect of the economic campaign against British dominance. There is, unfortunately, no completely accurate index for measuring the influence of the noncooperation crusade this year. Most of those who quote figures showing drops in trade allow their zeal for India to blind their eyes to general trade decreases everywhere. Nevertheless, the ordinary depression is far exceeded in the trade between India and Britain. The total imports from India into the United Kingdom, as given by official Government figures in the House of Commons, amounted in the first quarter of 1930 to 14,001,000 pounds, whereas the same period in 1929 showed 16,350,000 pounds. In the second quarter there was a drop from 11,719,000 pounds to 9,576,000 pounds. Exports from the United Kingdom to India showed greater losses. Monthly figures covering commodities constituting about seventy per cent of all trade are available, and these show an increasingly rapid falling off. For example, exports to India in August amounted only to 2,027,000 pounds as against 4,714,000 pounds for the same month in 1929; September of this year showed only 1,491,000 pounds in contrast to 3,728,000 pounds a year ago. Still more significant is the effect of the spinning campaign and the boycott of Lancashire cotton goods.

Speaking before a meeting of the Bengal Coal Company, Mr. J. H. Simpson on Dec. 18, admitted that the withdrawal of capital from companies and public funds during the last twelve months had been considerable. One Englishman of the extremely anti-Indian class, almost incoherent with rage, recently wrote to a leading British weekly to proclaim that "India is not their own country. By right of conquest India belongs to the British." But he also said, interestingly enough, out of much contact with the country, "Practically every firm in India has incurred enormous losses, and many have been compelled to effect drastic reductions in their staffs." May not Mr. Brailsford be right when he says that nothing can save the situation but generous action? India is vital to British economic interest; but as a friend it could be vastly more vital than it is today. Here is a nation of more than 300,000,000 people. All the population of the British dominions does not exceed 26,000,000. Why not be generous to India? One would think that self-interest alone would dictate a more flexible policy.

But India is neither a British nor an Indian problem, pure and simple. This struggle is a world issue. Nothing looms larger on the horizon of modern international relations than imperialism, political and economic, benevolent or oppressive. While distraught peoples are

restive under the existence of outside rule, no matter how well intended that rule may be, world peace will be an empty phrase. There can be no peace without the satisfaction of men's desires for justice and equality of status. Imperialism releases upon the whole world a subtle miasma that harms none more than imperialists themselves.

It is ruinous to self-reliance. England, we often hear, has been saved by her colonies. It may be so. But just as the white man in former days relaxed and grew shiftless when he had slaves to do his dirty work, so does imperial rule bring to those who wield it eventually a moral paralysis. This has been true historically of all imperialisms; is the British likely to escape unless it changes, as it has been changing, toward a more realistic partnership? I write not of British imperialism as better or worse than any other; I use it merely because it is our case in point.

Imperialism, too, is a frequent excuse for incompetence. If there is anything that thoughtful and traveled Englishmen agree on, particularly those who have been in Canada, Australia or New Zealand, it is the general slowness of British industry to take up new ideas, to go ahead and modernize productive processes. Yet they have been even slower, according to the views of intelligent Indians—whose impatience is undoubtedly a cause of occasional exaggeration—to approach the Indian question with energy, ambition, and open helpfulness. I have talked with countless Englishmen who freely admit a high degree of shortcoming, even failure, in the treatment of India over the long years behind. But one often finds the conventional argument that Indians are constitutionally, even biologically, incapable of self-rule. "What," I invariably ask, "after these many decades of British tutelage and aid?" The rest is silence. I am reminded more often than I would wish, of a certain man who was complaining of his wife. "The old lady," he said to an intimate, "ain't much good unless I beat her up a bit now and then and keep her in line." "Well," replied his friend, "why don't you leave her?" To which the first gentleman responded, sententiously, "What would she do without me?"

India well illustrates how imperialism breeds docility in its subject peoples. Only a miracle like Gandhi could have aroused the Indian masses from their lethargy into an animate, articulate desire; probably nothing like it historically was ever accomplished unless it was the stirring of China by her youth. Sadder still, imperialism usually brings the worst elements to the front. The *lathis*, after all are being wielded chiefly by Indians themselves, whose hope of profiting drives them to disloyalty against their own people. It is not an edifying spectacle to see the ascetic and saintly, if humanly imperfect, Gandhi languishing in prison, and with him many of saintly character also, while at the Round Table Conference, along with a number of fine men and women, are a coterie of those who have exploited their own people ruthlessly. Horse racers, polo players, and native nabobs may not necessarily be too low for regard, but I have no hesitancy in saying that not a few of those in places of distinction at the Round Table are unworthy to be there at all.

The deepest significance of the struggle from which the Round Table Conference seems so remote, is in its use of non-violence, adhered to in a remarkable degree, to put through a revoluntionary enterprise. This is not a new thing, as many commentators seem to think; a number of almost similar contests have occurred before in various parts of the world during the last few hundred years, some of them being rewarded with splendid victory for the non-violent side. But this struggle is on a scale previously unknown, and in a situation infinitely complex. It is strikingly bold, strikingly successful thus far, even if it may not carry on to victory at the finish. It is also strikingly prophetic, portentous of warless conflicts in the future, marked chiefly by the sufferance of hardship, unflinchingly, for the sake of a coveted freedom. Hence we see in India not merely a world issue of today, which it assuredly is, but an issue which reaches into the future with its possibilities of non-violent crusades instead of barbarous futile war. However it may end, no question, agitating our planet transcends it in significance for this harassed generation.
—*Christian Leader.*

Catholicism as a Culture

By George S. Bull

Catholicism is not merely a creed, it is a culture! I mean that it is not merely a set of propositions which have to do with religion directly, and in the strict sense of the word, but it is an attitude towards life as a whole. If a man is a Catholic, he is so not merely on Sunday, nor when in church, nor when giving his ideas about such things as the pope or the Bible, the mass, or salvation, or Christ; but also when he is discussing Homer, or Dante, or Oscar Wilde; or building a cathedral, or attending the opera, or buying stocks. In a word, there is no activity into which the spontaneous reactions, which are peculiar to him because he is a Catholic, do not come.

Catholicism in the Middle Ages

Now, this was always true. But what was not always true—yet is true today, and is one of the great causes of misunderstanding—is the fact that Catholicism as a culture is no more the culture of the modern world than, as a religion, it is the religion of the modern world. Catholic and non-Catholic today do not differ on the detail of dogma; they differ on life! Failure to recognize that the reformation ushered in a new culture as well as a new religion is one of the big sources of misconception today.

It is comparatively easy to realize that Catholicism in the middle ages was a culture and not merely a creed, for it has left the embodiment of its view of life in its own distinctive art, its own distinctive literature, its own philosophy, its own architecture. Dante and Fra Angelico, Chartres and Rheims only body forth in the realm of the esthetic that same fundamental approach to life which Aquinas couched in the explicit affirmations of the syllogism, and these creations, whether of beauty or of pure intellect, were but the lives of the men

of that day refracted through the medium of genius. But what is *not* easy to realize is that that attitude towards life is to be found in our midst today. It is not easy to remember that twenty million Americans hold in the 20th century substantially the view of life which Dante held, or Francis of Assisi.

There are two traits of the Catholic attitude towards life that not only beget misunderstanding between Americans who are Catholics and those who are not, but that also are the prime reasons why Catholics, cannot get themselves understood in the modern world. Those two traits are totality of view regarding life, and "other-worldliness." I do not think anyone who has even a casual acquaintance with Catholicism will have any difficulty in accepting totality of outlook as characteristic of Catholics. The 20th century Catholic looks out on the world today very much as did his fathers of the middle ages. Unity and totality were the marks not only of medieval thought but of medieval life.

> . . . there was one system of education for princes, lords and clerks; one sacred and learned language, the Latin; one code of morals; one ritual; one hierarchy, the church; one faith and one common interest against heathendom and against Islam; one community on earth and in heaven,—and one system of feudal habits for the whole west. (De Wulf, Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages, p. 131.)

Now if that unity and totality have passed from the civilization in which we now live, they have not passed from Catholic thinking on the fundamentals of existence. Catholics still believe that every sphere of human life is related essentially to every other, and that in the conscious and deliberate activity of man there is no action which can be evaluated as an absolute entity—isolated, that is, from the central fact of man's relation to the rest of the universe. This very tendency to totality sets the Catholic at odds with the whole modern outlook on life.

Modern Thought Departmentalized

For it is clear, I think, that modern thought, like modern life, is departmentalized. Our institutions in this respect only reflect our thoughts. The dominant ideal is separation: separation of church and state; separation of religion and education; of science and philosophy, even of religion and morality. And what is true of the world that modern man has made, is also true within the microcosm of modern man himself. He tries to live as though his social nature were one thing and his individual nature another; as though his life were set like concrete in so many molds; as though there were compartments for his thoughts, his emotions, his actions, like the divisions in his desk.

We have, then, the antithesis of totality versus sectionalism or departmentalization, in the outlook on life. We have also the antithesis of other-worldliness versus worldliness. I do not mean to say that

Catholics alone believe in a world to come. But I think I am safe in saying that, as compared with the modern culture, the idea of the other world looms larger in the Catholic view.

It seems to me that non-Catholics are affected, to a large extent, by the very lack of orientation to life which I mentioned just above. The non-Catholic attitude is something to this effect: "We are sure of what we have. We are not sure (not *so* sure, at any rate) of what is to come. Let us appreciate the present, then, while we have it. Doubtless, there is another world—but let us make this one a better place to live in." Whereas the Catholic view is that the thing of ultimate importance is not here but hereafter, and, in fact, that this world has genuine value only in so far as it leads to the next.

Causes of Misunderstanding

We know upon what little things misconception may sometimes turn. I can come to like or dislike a man merely from the poise of his head or the manner of his walk. I once heard Major-General Sir Frederick Maurice tell a group of American students at Cambridge university that during the war he had found American soldiers definitely at odds with English soldiers because, as one chap expressed it, "them fellers drinks tea."

Catholics insist upon their own schools because totality of outlook is fundamental to a Catholic's view of life. It may be wrong to take it for granted that life cannot be departmentalized—though, of course, being what I am, I am sure it is not—but when a non-Catholic perceives the background for my point of view he sees my sincerity. The clash between the Catholic and non-Catholic on other-worldliness is illustrated in the question of birth control. The modern multiplies reasons to show that birth control will aid temporal happiness (I, of course, do not think it true), and the Catholic goes on thinking first of eternal happiness. A non-Catholic may not agree with me, but if he knows my general outlook on life he will see that my attitude on birth control is not superstition, but fits in with a general scheme of life. Realization of backgrounds like this may make it easier to be tolerant toward a culture other than one's own.—*Christian Century.*

Book Review

NOTE—*Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.*
(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)

Pathways to Certainty, by *W. Adams Brown.* Chas Scribner's Sons, New York, 1930. 293 pages, $2.50.

That religious certainty has been shaken in a great many minds at the present time, cannot be denied. Over against the established results of scientific research it seems as though the religious man has nothing solid and secure to stand on. John Dewey in his recent Hibbert Lectures and W. Lippmann in his "Preface to Morals" take the position that it is impossible to arrive at certainty as to the existence of God. The "Humanists" of the Unitarian Church, accepting the verdict of the scientific world have abandoned the faith in the objective reality of God and put in its place the human ideals of truth, goodness and beauty. The Christian Church at large, however, is by no means ready to give up its claim to the reality of the object of its faith. The conviction to stand upon the rock of truth has been the very life of the great leaders of the church in all the crises of its history. If today this assurance were no longer to be held, if the advance of science meant that the faith of our forefathers was no more than a superstition, our predicament would be indeed overwhelming. Fortunately the case of the Christian faith is far from being desperate.

Dr. Brown in this book undertakes to show that even in this scientific age the Christian can walk on sure ground. The certainty of science is one thing and the certainty of religion is another. Science has to do with the objects and forces of the material world. Its method includes a working hypothesis, observation, test by experiment, tentative conclusions, established facts. Religion has to do with things that cannot be measured quantitatively. They belong in the world of "values", like beauty, goodness, love; they can only be enjoyed by those who have a sense of appreciation. The apostle says, "not all men have faith." Personal attitude and receptiveness are essential to religious growth; only those who seek the Holy Grail with ardent desire will find it. Or, to vary the figure, fellowship with the divine is only open to him who follows the yearning of the soul, who trusts his human needs into the keeping of an omnipotent hand and an all-loving heart.

Four ways are open to us, to certainty, says the writer. The first is that of authority, be it the authority of the church or the Bible. In immature age we are all under the influence of others, parents, school, church or society. The whole heritage of our mental world is thus passed on to us. All our beliefs come to us by way of transmission. Many, perhaps the majority of men, never change this atti-

tude towards the hereditary faith. They were Catholics because born in the Catholic church; they are Protestants and believe in the teachings of the Bible: and their whole lives move along in the same tradition. Others again, when they come to years of discretion or under the influence of the time, adopt different attitudes and develop new views about the objects of faith. The second way to certainty is that of intuition. By this the writer means the sudden insight a man has in his inner life. Things become clear to him he never quite understood before. Such experiences are landmarks in individual development. They give to the person that has them immediate assurance of the reality of his faith. It is the mystical element of faith, more or less present in all cases, but preeminent in the case of the genuine mystic, those men and women of all lands and religions who achieve a high degree of certitude by cultivating the presence of God without the aid of outward means (such as the study of scripture or the regular ways of religious worship).

The third path to certainty is that of reason. Faith and religious experience may primarily have its field in the emotions and the will. It will, nevertheless, take hold of the intellect. We feel obliged to coordinate it with the rest of our lives and with the totality of our knowledge. Even the early Christians were exhorted by the apostle to give a reason for the hope that was in them. Medieval theology's main aim was to show that the faith of religioh and the teachings of philosophy were in absolute agreement. Many arguments have been undertaken to demonstrate the reality of the existence of a divine being. We know today that a strictly conclusive evidence of this kind cannot be given. Still we consider it a legitimate object of the philosophy of religion to point out the reasonableness of the Christian faith. In spite of all the objections science raises to the existence of an infinite and loving ruler of the universe, it still seems a natural explanation of all the facts before us to assume that back of the world of human personalities there is a supreme intelligence and power with which we can hold intercourse.

The last way to certainty is that of experiment. Live according and up to your faith and you'll be convinced of its usefulness. "Do the will of my father and you will find my teachings true." Religion calls for action, not only for feeling or thought. Its aim is the establishment of God's Kingdom. This is not possible except through lives of worship and loving service. The writer says, in conclusion, "So, accepting our responsibility for today with cheerful courage we contribute our part to that enlarging store of wisdom which will make assurance easier for them who come after us. Living by the light of a reasoned and tested faith, trusting the insight which comes to us in our best moments, drawing faith and comfort from the convictions of those who have gone before us, we win for ourselves the certainty we need and we help to communicate it to others."

We are in agreement with the author concerning his four ways to certainty. We also underscore his statement that they are to be used permanently, not consecutively only. We should put more em-

phasis on the authority of the Word and, especially, on the teachings of Jesus. What he says about God and God's relation to man, and what he says about the redemption of man, remains authoritative to us whatever science or historical criticism may say. The author has produced quite a number of books. They are distinguished by a sincere search after truth, a devout Christian spirit and great skill in clarifying difficulties by luminous statement.

Pastor's Pocket Manual, edited by *Rev. H. J. Schick, D.D.*, Eden Publishing House, 1930. 192 pages, bound in Persian Morocco, gilt edge, gold-stamped title, pocket size (4⅛ x 6¼ inches), price $1.90, by mail, $2.00 net.

Our long looked for Pastor's Pocket Manual is here, handy of size (a little shorter than the old one and lighter in bulk) and rich in binding.

It contains many features not found in the old. Under Baptism, for instance, there is a form for the Confirmation of Lay-Baptism. Under Marriage we have two forms and, besides, in the appendix, the marriage service of the Episcopal Church for those who have a preference for this. Then there is one for the 25th or 50th anniversary of marriage. In chapter four, the Order for the Administration of Holy Communion, there are Notes on Pew Communion Service, in which this service—now often preferred in large congregations—is fully described.

The Manual is especially rich in Scripture Lessons, Verses and Prayers for the Sick and Dying. They are all grouped according to their character (affliction, repentance, faith and trust, hope of eternal life, etc.).

The chapter on the Burial of the Dead provides for all conceivable occasions and cases. It contains ten different committals (one for Cremation).

It is followed by Suggested Texts for Peculiar Occasions and Poetical Selections for Funeral Services (very beautiful and uplifting). Finally we get even a chapter on Personal Evangelism, which supplies scripture passages for the proper approach to seekers and unconverted.

All material furnished by the Editor is in his well known chaste and careful language. A very complete index enables the user to turn at once to the desired subject. The book will be sure, we believe, of a hearty welcome on the part of our pastors. It will become their never failing friend, a rich source of inspiration and comfort to pastor and people. We congratulate the Editor and the Literary Committee on this work and wish the book Godspeed and an ever growing popularity.

Prayers for General Use and Special Occasions. Eden Publishing House, 1930. 136 pages.

Here is a little (3 by 4¾ inches) book of prayers. The Table of Contents reads as follows: the Lord's Prayer; Prayers at Table; Prayers for Home and Family; Daily Prayers for Two Weeks, Short Medita-

tions; Prayers for Festivals and Special Holidays; Prayers for Sunday Schools and Societies; Prayers in Times of Distress; Selections from Psalms and Hymns.

The Literary Committee (Prof. W. Baur, chairman), which has put out this booklet, deserves the thanks of the Church. The prayers are not hurriedly put together, nor are they a repetition of empty and worn-out phrases. They are fresh in thought and beautiful in expression. They can be used by minister and layman and will doubtless stimulate in both the spirit of prayer and train them in the language of devotion. On account of its handy size the little volume can be carried in the pocket and be taken out for use whenever the spirit moves one. As to the price the Publishing House says:

"Prayers" is to be had in three editions: Cellusuede Cover 25c, $2.40 per dozen; cloth bound, with gold stamped title 35c, and gift edition with gilt edge and in gift carton 60c. On the first mentioned edition our pastors will be charged at the dozen price, regardless of the quantity ordered, on the cloth and gift editions we allow you 15% discount. We pay postage.

Daily Talks with God. Calendar of Devotions for Family Worship. Eden Publishing House. Price, 60c.

The "Daily Talks with God" for 1931 have been out for some time. They have enjoyed a deserved popularity in past years. Again they come to us to guide us in the morning devotions of this new year. They consist in a Bible verse for each day, a thoughtful, earnest exposition of the same, and a brief prayer. Much has been said in recent years about the importance of raising up again the family altar in the homes of our Church. These talks offer us a welcome aid to do it in a convenient and impressive way. If conscientiously used they will prove a spiritual blessing to those who are concerned about their inner life.

Religion in Human Affairs, by *Clifford Kirkpatrick, Ph.D.*, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania. John Wiley and Son, New York, 1929—530 pages.

According to the title of the book and the express statement of the author in the preface, its main task is to show the functions of religion in its effect on social processes and cultural relationship. In these respects has it been a help or a hindrance, a great motive force or a leaden weight on the wheels of progress? By way of anticipation we may say that the appraisal of religion made by the writer is almost wholly to its discredit. Religion has always been conservative rather than progressive. Morality and enlightenment has more often come from other sources than from organized religion.

The writer begins his book with long chapters on the origin and evolution of religion. He had originally made personal studies about the religion of the Winnebago Indians and the Ekoi (Nigeria) and the ancient Egyptians and had intended to include them in this book. He gave up these plans because of lack of space but nevertheless he

quotes enough from the Winnebagos and other pre-literate peoples to make this introductory part rather bulky. At the same time he omits a discussion of Christian beginnings altogether, saying that Case and Lake and others have made this almost unnecessary. He certainly does not seem to have an adequate evaluation of Christianity. Ever and again he illustrates a statement by a reference to the Winnebagos, to some African tribe, to Australian savages, or to the Jewish and Christian religion as though they were all on the same level.

On the whole the author seems to agree with Draper and his discussion of the spiritual history of man into three stages: the age of faith, of doubt and of science; or perhaps he would add one more chapter to it and make the age of susperstition precede that of faith. At any rate, with many moderns he is persuaded that science is the great champion who has crowded religion clear off the stage. He reviews the past and can, of course, point to a development which reflects no honor on the Christian church. He mentions Andrew White's famous book on "The History of the Warfare of Science with Theology." From medieval times down to our own, the Church has always withstood the advance of science if science dared to teach what was new or contrary to the teachings of the Church. The author adds to White's voluminous evidence the anti-evolution trial in Tennessee in which Mr. W. J. Bryan achieved such unenviable prominence.

Today, although there are plenty of backward people, the whole trend of the time is on the side of science. We notice everywhere a decline of supernaturalism. Even the church people themselves have given up their faith in the miracles of the Bible. Or at least the Liberals have. These Liberals place their emphasis on ethical conduct, on the "way of life" rather than on dogmas; they are not interested so much in systems of salvation, or in physical resurrection stories, or in the hereafter. Their religion is this-worldly; their ideal is to make this world better and enable people to lead an abundant life in it. The author thinks that in time the Liberals will become more and more outspoken and finally merge with the Radicals, whose religion is a cultivation of humanistic values only.

Even religion's influence on morals, according to the author, is not so favorable as is often claimed. He points to the spirit of intolerance, to the religious wars, to the "Holy Inquisition," to the part the churches took in the late World War. Religious people are no better than outsiders. Morals and characters can be better trained by general education and idealism than under the often narrow and hardened spirit of the church.

A chapter is given to the religious disorganization of the Protestant Church with its 200 sects. Today there is a desire for unity. The author holds out little hope for the accomplishment of this task. There will always be the 4 or 5 leading Protestant denominations in this country.

In conclusion the writer contends that he believes in the persistence of religion. Some may replace it for themselves with art, or science or humanitarianism; others again, a good many, don't want

to be alone in the universe. If they claim they have fellowship with God as really as they have with a human friend, who is to say them nay?

The author quotes many books and authorities. As far as we can see he never makes his own position plain. He reminds us of an Old Testament professor in the seminary who always told us what Delitzsch or Wellhausen had said, but never what his own opinion was.

The book is interesting in many ways. It informs us on the limitations of the Christian religion; it does not do justice to its power and value.

The Karl Barth Theology, or *The New Transcendentalism* by *Alvin Sylvester Zerbe*, Ph.D., D.D., Professor Emeritus, Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio. Central Publishing House, Cleveland, Ohio, 1930.—279 pages, $2.25 net, postpaid.

The theology of Karl Barth and his school (E. Brunner, E. Thurneysen, F. Gogarten, and others) has had a phenomenal growth of influence in Germany. Barth's first publication, the commentary on Romans, appeared in 1919, the author being a young man of 33 then, and today there is no theologian on the continent that has a similar following. It is all the more surprising, therefore, that he is so little known in America. Several men of note have reviewed his writings (Knudson, Bixler, R. Niebuhr), but it was evident in every case that they could not make much of them and of him. There is a good deal of Kantian philosophy in them, for which Americans have little taste. Besides, his style is so full of paradoxes, so involved and unwieldy (Zerbe quotes one sentence having 300 words) that the reader is apt to get weary in a short time. He wonders how a man who fairly revels in exasperating contradictions could get a hearing at all.

Still the fact that Barth has reached such eminence, in a few years, on the other side, and that his fame has even become international should prevent us from casting his theology aside unheard. We, therfore, welcome gratefully the book before us, by Dr. Zerbe, which undertakes a careful appreciation of B.'s position and, in so doing, allows B. to speak for himself as much as possible. It might almost, of not altogether, be called a "source book" on Barthianism, says the author. Z. very modestly does not claim to be sure, in every case, of having understood B. fully. What seems to us a most astonishing thing is the fact that a man of 83 has undertaken such a laborious and difficult task as interpreting Barth to an American audience, and that he has done it so well.

Barth calls his theology a theology of crisis because it was written under the impression that we have reached a critical stage in the development of Christian thought. Spengler, in his famous book "The Decline of the West", is of the opinion that our whole Western civilization is in the sign of decay. Barth, on his part, believes that modern theology is in a state of dissolution. It is all imbued with the spirit of immanence, with the faith that man is good and that the sin clinging to him will be sloughed off in a process of education and self-better-

ment; that man by using the methods of science and the inspiration of Christian ideals, will gradually become better and establish the Kingdom of God on this earth.

Against all this hoping, striving and dreaming, Barth hurls a thunderous No! True religion is never a movement of man to God, it is always a movement of God to man. Over against the modern emphasis on the immanence of God he stresses the divine *transcendence* in such a way that it seems impossible for man ever to come to a real union with God. "Finitum non capax infiniti" (the finite can't hold the infinite) is his slogan. Man cannot understand, he cannot record divine revelation. If therefore he as a theologian is compelled to give expression to his faith it cannot be done in the ordinary way of human speech. It must be done in a way that allows the human and the divine, the this-side and the yon-side, the temporal and the eternal both to be heard. B, calls this way of speaking the *dialectic* way and, therefore, his own theology, the *dialectic theology.* It is this character of his argument and his style that makes the study of his writings so exceedingly provoking and unsatisfactory. It accounts for his endless paradoxes. He says, Christ is the great paradox of the world. True, but yet Christ did not always speak in paradoxes. If he had, the common people would not have heard him so gladly.

Dr. Zerbe in his work discusses first B.'s Prolegomena; then his Dualisms; then his Transcendentalism. We can only quote a little from his arguments. In Prolegomena we read: God is a deus reconditus, a hidden God. His purposes are inscrutable. Still he is a real, living God, not a finite God, nor a democratic one. The Great theme of B.'s theology is the infinite qualitative difference between and eternity.

Ad B.'s "Dualisms." All faith takes place in eternity, it has a pure transtemporal beginning. The real Christian redemption is not in this world but the next. The whole N. T. conception is eschatologically oriented. True faith implies eschatology; without it its implications would not be realized. Human history is only the scene of relativities, faith has to do with the absolute. Therefore it is directed not to history but to the end of it. Eternity and time are related as yes and no. "Schleiermacher magnifies the present world and minimizes the future."

The only thing man can do concerning God is to fear him, for man is a vessel of wrath. There can be no revelation of God to man, for man is in time, God in eternity. Faith constitutes no merit, it is only a vacuum, a "Hohlraum." If it is not a vacuum it is unbelief.

The revelation of God in Christ is at the same time the strongest conceivable veiling of God (it is a Kenosis).

"We know that God is the one we do not know and this not-knowing is the problem and the origin of our knowing."

"God is the pure negation, the yon-side of the this-side, the negation of the negatives."

The Bible as "the fallible word of man:" It is an accidental conglomeration of writings. Fallible man cannot understand and there-

fore not record a divine revelation (see above). The Barthians accept all the results (or alleged results) of Bible criticism.

The Bible as the "infallible word of God." The Bible is the *word of God* but *not the words* of God. The records and narratives of the Bible are not be viewed as history. Ordinary history is not real history. How do we know the Bible is the word of God? It is self-revealing, self-authenticating.

All human history is a farce, it comes to nothing.

The resurrection of Jesus Christ is not an historical event, at most historical at the border of the unhistorical. "Fasse wer's fassen kann," here annotates Dr. Zerbe, we agree with him. "Jesus is a riddle, a dark spot in the continuum."

The unknown God revealed himself in Christ. And yet, in Jesus God became a mystery. Faith in Jesus is the venture of all ventures. "Jesus is a character wholly negative, he has no positive qualities" (!) Faith has nothing to do with pious feelings or with religious experience. Faith is not trust (fiducia) but a symbol of a transcendent act of God. (!)

The historical reality of Jesus need give us no concern. The "picture of Jesus as poetry and truth (Dichtung and Wahrheit) is more potent than all historical investigation."

Schleiermacher said we have God in feeling and experience. This is a papistic theory, says Barth.

In the 3rd and last part, Z. treats B.'s transcendentalism, takes up Kant's influence on Barth: We know only phenomena, the "thing in itself is unkown. God is transcendental, beyond the reach of sense experience; therefore also his existence not to be demonstrated by scientific proof. He is reached by the postulate of the practical reason.

B. with most other German theologians, adopts Kant's reasoning that a valid theoretical proof of the existence of God cannot be given. God is and remains transcendental. What, however, reason could not do God enables man to do by the gift of faith.

Barth and his followers emphasize that their theology is based on the word of God. Nevertheless, they accept the most destructive positions of biblical criticism. According to Bultmann we know really nothing of Jesus' life and personality ("wirklich nichts"). The N. T. has its legendary elements. But, as was said before, even if there is "Dichtung" mixed with "Wahrheit" in the picture of Jesus, it is more powerful thus than if historical investigation had proved the historicity of all details. History, anyway, is only the "scene of relativities". Of the life of Jesus only his death and resurrection seems to have value for B. And this resurrection of Jesus is not an historical event, he goes on to say. What, in the name of common sense, is it then?

B. takes no interest in subjective, experimental religion. The Methodists and Pietists he seems to regard with particlar aversion. Rather with the church in hell, he says, than with pietists of lower or higher rank in a heaven that does not exist. His criticism of the

existing church is unsparing too. In it there are the people who "steal the livery of heaven to serve the devil in."

After reading Dr. Zerbe's book we must confess that we don't like B.'s theology any more than we did before. It must have been an exceedingly unpleasant task to wade through pages and pages of "yes and no," of "this-side and yon-side," of Barth giving something with the one hand and taking it away with the other.

We congratulate Dr. Zerbe on his valor and persistence, and we venture to hope that when we go through his book again we shall have more patience with Barth's dialectics. All those who want to become acquainted with Barth in an English translation ought to get this book, for there are only two other English books written by Barthians. One of these we discuss under the next title.

The Theology of Crisis, by *Emil Brunner*, Professor of Theology, University of Zurich. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1929. 118 pages.

After reading Barth we were pleasantly surprised when we started on this little book by E. Brunner, one of the Barthian school. It is written in a lucid style and we could only wish that Barth would learn a little in this respect from this other member of his school. The volume contains five lectures delivered at the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church (Lancaster, Pa.). Br. tells us in the first chapter what the theology of crisis is. It is not modernism, for modernism is the dissolution of Christian theology. It has given up (see Troeltsch, especially) the claim that in Christ we have a revelation of absolute divine truth. Nor is it fundamentalism, for fundamentalism is the petrification of Christianity. Besides, the Fundamentalist errs, with the Methodist, in his view of conversion. "As if conversion were the process by which a sinful man is actually transformed into a Christian man!"

Then he goes on to speak on the Quest of Truth—Revelation; the Quest of Life: Salvation; the Problem of Ethics, and Progress and the Kingdom of God.

The study of these chapters will reveal the main points of the new theology and, in particular, show the Barthian relation to the Social Gospel.

The reader will appreciate the fact that Brunner is a forceful, interesting, and, above all, an intelligible writer. This little volume will therefore serve as a welcome introduction to the formidable theology of the head of the school.

Laughter and Health, by *James J. Walsh*, M.D., Ph.D., Sc.D., Litt.D., K. C. St. G., Medical Director of Fordham University School of Sociology; Professor of Physiological Psychology; Cathedral College, New York, 1928. 197 pages.

In a list of books on "How to Keep Mentally Fit", we found this one; its title at once attracted our attention.

That good, hearty laughter is good for the health, we all know. Laugh and grow fat, is a popular saying. When we read the title of

the book we thought that perhaps, besides being scientific, it would also be so funny as to make us laugh at least half a dozen times. In this we found we were mistaken. It is altogether a serious book, and what else could be expected from an author who is a doctor of medicine, of philosophy, of science and of literature, all at the same time.

Laughter, he says, is a convulsive movement in the diaphragm and exerts a favorable influence on all the other organs of the body. If function alone has been disturbed and no organic changes have taken place, laughter may be useful in restoring health as well as in preserving it. The diaphragm is in more or less close contact with all the important bodily organs, and through laughter an immense amount of organic stimulation can be secured in the most natural way, the diaphragm carrying on a kind of massage by its movements. The book shows at length how the lungs, the heart, liver, pancreas, spleen, stomach and intestines are favorably affected by it. "The animal, on all fours" the writer says, "has all its organs fastened to its backbone, swinging rather freely in its pendent abdomen when it moves, while human organs press closer upon each other by gravity, and thus encourage sluggish tendencies. Laughter, by stirring up all the organs, relieves this tendency, and hence it is that man has the instinct for laughter as a compensation for his erect position."

A special chapter is given to the relation of laughter to the mind. Men who can tell good stories are real benefactors of mankind, for they lift up people's hearts, quite literally, by means of their diaphragm and set their circulation and respiration going more rapidly than before. Laughter makes one expansive in outlook and it is very likely to give the feeling that the future need not be the subject of quite so much solicitude as is usually allowed for it.

We have come to appreciate more the immense significance of the influence of the mind on the body. Some have carried the employment of this factor too far (Coué and others).

Still, serious-minded people, particularly, ought to benefit by the right kind of mind-cure. "Over-attention to one's self is inhibitory, wholesome neglect and leaving to nature is good therapy, and laughter will add the stimulant element towards convalescence that is so often needed. There is nothing that makes us forget so completely about functions of the body that we may have been solicitous over as good hearty laughter. It dissipates the intense concentration of attention on some bodily function, which so often proves to be the principal cause of the disturbance in that function. Diversion of mind is the most important thing in the world. Laughter constitutes the best diversion we have. The laugh-cure will beat all the new-fangled methods of healing, if we can only get people to take it with confidence."

Christianizing a Nation. Being the Enoch Pond Lectures delivered at Bangor Theological Seminary by *Charles E. Jefferson*, Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. Doubleday, Doran and Co., Garden City, N. Y., 1929. 200 pages.

Is there a Christian nation? is the opening question the author voices. Many answer it in the negative. J. admits that no nation is Christian in the full sense of the word. But there are nations which have in them so many devout men and women who are striving to reproduce the life of Jesus, and which show at so many points in governmental action the spirit of the founder of the Christian religion, that they may rightfully bear the name of Christian. We ought to form the habit of thinking of Christianity more often in the terms of national life. The spirit of nationalism that has been growing so strongly in the last decades is fraught with abundant evil. It is a narrow, selfish spirit that seeks the advantage of its own group at the expense of other nations.

According to J. the New Testament is an incomparable handbook for all who wish to build up their nation in keeping with the will of God. Jesus enunciated and lived high and noble principles and his apostles went out with the avowed purpose of making them the moral and spiritual foundation of the heathen peoples. His chief law was that of the love of one's neighbor. Nations rely on force rather than justice. They are ranked according to military and naval strength. "Not so," says Jesus, "shall it be among you. If any one would be great among you, let him be your minister, and whosoever would be first among you let him be your servant." A nation truly Christian will obey the Golden Rule when it writes its tariff legislation. "We are always keen to our rights—especially our property rights—and blear-eyed to our duties."

Christians have come to see that Christianity is a social religion and that it moves towards a social goal. That social goal is named the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of God is society perfected. For this ideal world order we are to seek with all our heart. There are still those who believe the world is doomed and only Christ's physical return can save it. They are the believers in the individual gospel only. Because Christ and the apostles worked for the salvation of the individual, therefore we must restrict ourselves in like manner, they say. They forget that the times have changed and that we are now in a position to use our influence for the reorganization of society.

Should then the church enter into national politics, or should the pulpit? No, says the writer, church and pulpit are apt to do more evil than good if they identify themselves with any political cause or party. Only when a cause essentially moral has become a political issue, then the church should espouse it with all earnestness. Such was the case with prohibition, and such is the case with the abolition of war.

And then the author goes into the fight for a warless world. Jefferson has been a manly champion in this field for many years and this last chapter on the church's relation to international peace and brotherhood is the strongest of the whole book. It is a scathing arraignment of the church for its failure to stop the last war, or even to have the least influence on its conduct or the peace terms (in relation to this latter point J. does unfortunately not occupy the ad-

vanced position of the most enlightened historians of the day. Rev.). Still he contends for the progress of the Prince of Peace with a valor, an eloquence and a logic so irresistible that he carries the reader with him in glorious fashion.

The volume is a very creditable piece of work of our old friend. Of course he occupies a diametrically different position on the Kingdom of God from Barth and the Barthians—as we have shown on another page of this issue—but he builds his argument also on good foundations and with a great deal more of perspicuity than the Swiss theologian.

Methods of Private Religious Living, by *Henry Nelson Wieman,* University of Chicago. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1929. 219 pages.

Professor Wieman, before this known to us as the author of two other books, on "Religious Experience and Scientific Method," and "The Wrestle with Truth," here offers a volume of a very personal nature. He describes the methods which he has pursued for years in the building up of his own religious life. He says, his "central theme in this book is worship; for worship is the way we ride the winds that lift the highest. The solution of our social problems and the historic march of society toward whatever good the ages have in store, depend more on the right conduct of private religious living than upon anything else." Hence he begins his account with a statement of the technique he has found helpful in his private worship. Three preconditions for such worship must be met, he says: A man must be serious, he must be sincere, and he must seclude himself from distracting stimuli. Then follow thse *act* of worship. The first step is to relax and suffuse one's mind with the sense of the encompassing, sustaining, integrating presence which some of us call "God." The second is a becoming aware of the possibilities of personal improvement and social transformations that dawn upon us at such occasions. There follows self-analysis and readjustment of our attitude. The last step is a kind of auto-suggestion. Not that auto-suggestion can do the work of the "process called God" (quotation marks are ours, Rev.), but it can enable us to make the required adjustment to this process.

Religion, the writer goes on to say, releases human energy by adjusting the individual in such a way that the process called God shapes the organs of the body and the impulses of the heart to the end of maximun constructive behavior. But what is God? He is not merely an idea. God is the integrating process at work in the universe. It is that which makes for increasing interdependence and cooperation in the world. The chaos in the human world is to be reduced to organic order. The principle of integration at the human level is love. And this process goes on whether we will or not. It is more than human in the sense that it goes on independently of human purpose. But it will not lift humanity to the great goods of life unless men make right adaptation to it.

The process of progressive integration is cosmic in its scope. How completely this tendency may dominate the universe as a whole is a

matter for further investigation. Nevertheless the universe seems to be so constituted that this movement toward higher integration springs up again and again under all manner of conditions, places and times.

In the chapter following the author seeks to show how the individual by fitting himself into this integrating process and by discovering his organic funtion in it, is enabled to make his contribution to the reconstruction of society; for it is not the churches but outstanding personalities who are going to further this great task. There are chapters on Meeting a Crisis, Public Worship, Fellowship, Finding Joy in Life; Methods of Mysticism, and a concluding one on Method in Religion.

The chief criticism we have to make of the book is on the author's conception of God. In his first book God was the indifferentiated mass of innumerable stimuli playing upon us." In his second, God was "that feature of our total environment which most vitally affects the continuance and welfare of human life." In the book before us God is "the integrating process at work in the universe," or the "constitutional tendency of the universe toward progressive integration." God, then, is a process or a tendency of the universe, a process towards integration—the author uses this word on nearly every page—meaning towards greater unity, harmony and perfection. He is not even the power behind that process. Much less a person. W. calls it absurd to say, the God I want must be a person, else I won't have him. Still the author says himself, the principle of integration at the human level is love. He says furthermore, that the highest historic achievement accomplished by the process towards integration so far, is human society in its ideal state, therefore with the principle of love on the throne. And yet, back of that process there is no loving personality.

It will in no wise be satisfactory to call God a process at work in the universe, or a tendency of the universe. It would be the same as calling God a process of evolution. Doing this might win the approbation of some scientists. But the human heart would never be satisfied with it. And the human mind has always argued that since personality is the highest stage in biological and psychological development that has been reached, there must be the personality element in the deity.

Our Christian religion takes it as a matter of course that ours is a personal God. Jesus taught us to call him our father. But W.'s book mentions Jesus and the Bible only incidently, not as authorities. W.'s religious ideas are not distinctively Christian at all, they are humanistic; they are vague and bloodless. We don't see how they could make anyone's religious pulse beat more quickly. Besides, his style and argumentation have not the popular appeal. His logical acumen sometimes leads him to endless differentiations. E. g. in his chapter on mysticisms, he describes 12 kinds of mysticism minutely. We are sorry that we can't do any better for Professor Wieman, whose books have seemed to some to strike a new note. We had expected that his book would impress us a little like J. G. Gilkey's "Secrets of

Effective Living" (see B. R. Jan., 1930, p. 71ff). The books deal with similar subjects, but Gilkey's seemed to us so much more concrete and helpful than the Chicago professor's.

From Babylon to Bethlehem. The Story of the Jews for the last five centuries before Christ, by *Lawrence E. Browne*, Cambridge, W. Heffer and Sons Limited, 1926. 106 pages.

This brief volume covers the period from the Babylonian Exile to the birth of Christ. With the advent of Cyrus the Jews come under the dominion of the Persian empire. This epoch lasts for 200 years when Alexander the Great defeats Darius, the Persian king, and erects a world empire. At his death his creation soon goes to pieces and Palestine becomes subject, in turns, to the Ptolemies of Egypt, and to the Seleucids of Syria. Antiochus Epiphanes of Syria undertakes the destruction of the Jewish nation, but under the leadership of the Maccabees (especially Judas the "Hammer") the Jews are able to maintain themselves. For a time they were governed by high priests of the house of the Maccabees, until the Romans took possession of Palestine under Pompey. A little later the Romans made the Idumean Herod King of the Jews. Towards the end of his reign Jesus was born.

The period under consideration marks the rise of *Judaism*. There were still a few prophets like Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and others; but they were not like the great prophets.

The law was reduced to writing and, instead of the living word of the prophets, it became the source of the religious life and conduct of the people. The function of the religious teachers got to be more and more to erect a "fence" around the law. The Jews rid themselves of all non-Jewish elements; recall "the great divorce" under Ezra (when the Samaritan wives were cast adrift) and the rejection of Samaritan approaches towards reunion. The heroic fight under the Maccabees intensified their religious fanaticism.

In the 4th century the Priestly code was drafted and the Pentateuch was completed. The consummation of the "Thora" was followed by the Nebiim, the prophets, and the "Writings", of which latter collection the psalms and the wisdom literature were the most important.

During the Maccabean period the Chasidim (the "godly") became a vital element of the people. They lived in the country and had their synagogues there. From them came a large support to the fighting force of those leaders.

The doctrine of the future life and of the resurrection of the dead was developed at this time. The book of Daniel dates from this period. The belief in the coming Messiah was prominent in the Apocalyptic literature of the day. The Pharisees were the most influential religious sect, springing up about 105 B. C. The Sadducees were the descendants of the Hellenizers of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes; political influence was more to them than religious sincerity.

The author's book gives helpful information on the fortunes of

the Jews in these 500 years, so little known to the general Bible reader. His critical views are far advanced. He is e. g. not satisfied with a second Isaiah; the word Jesus read in the synagogue of Nazareth (Luke 4) he ascribes to a third Isaiah. Still, his chief intention is to help the N. T. student to realize the background of Jewish thought in the days preceding the coming of Christ. To some extent it may be said that this hope has been realized.

Evening Echoes. A Volume of Lyrics, by *Julius Kircher*, Chicago. Copyright, 1930, by J. Kircher. Order from Eden Publishing House, St. Louis, or from the author, 2009 W. 22nd Place, Chicago. 115 pages, $1.50.

Julius Kircher, whose poetical nature we had become acquainted with through his former volumes, "Emma" and "Stille Stunden", here offers us what he calls the "Evening Echoes" of his life. The writer is at his best when he catches the moods of nature and interprets them for us with the poet's happy touch. Or, perhaps, we should say he comes closest to us in his love songs. In his first volume, "Emma", he had already given us many glimpses of the happiness he had found in his wife's sweet and gentle nature. And now in these Evening Echoes he frequently returns to the same entrancing subject. When he lost his wife, the blow nearly crushed him. The poems in which he expresses his devastating sorrow are pathetic. However, the reader rejoices to see that the husband's deep anguish finally gives way to Christian resignation and faith. The last two chapters contain war and religious poems. In the latter group K. at times reaches the level of our beloved church hymn writers.

The book opens with a sketch of the poet's life, written by R. A. John, K.'s intimate friend. It is adorned with ten beautiful illustrations. We wish it a happy and successful journey. It is well qualified to deepen our appreciation of the author's rich and genial personality.

Sermon Sketches on the Old Epistle Pericopes, by *J. A. Dell.* The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio, 1930. 158 pages, $2.00 net.

There are very few, if any, ministers in our Church who would undertake now to preach throughout the year on the Epistle pericopes. Reviewer has never done so and he has not lately heard of any other following such a course. We venture to say that a majority of the older brethren are still glad to follow the gospel pericopes in their pulpit presentations, but of the younger clergy most have adopted the custom of choosing "free texts" almost Sunday after Sunday.

In the Lutheran Church it is different. It is more conservative than we are, and so they have doubtless a good many who even today feed their congregations occasionally on a whole year of epistle texts. For such this book offers helpful material. It gives them a sermon sketch for each Sunday; and the text is not only a motto or a peg to hang certain not very pertinent thoughts on. No, the text is expounded carefully each time and on it the application to present con-

ditions is based. The position of the writer is orthodox throughout; we have not found a single departure from conventional lines. The "Social Gospel" that has such a large place in our preaching, receives no mention at all, as far as we have seen; but individual faith, earnestness and sincerity are heavily stressed. Two to three pages (large sized) are given to each sketch, so that the author's Lutheran brethren, who still adhere to Pericope preaching on the Epistles, will unquestionably welcome such practical help. If the *subjects* of the sketches had been given in the Index, not only the texts, then others might turn to the book in such cases where they happened to be drawn to a similar theme.

Weniger Predigt! Mehr Tat und mehr andre Formen der Verkündigung von **H. Baehr.** Verlag von Alfred Toepelmann in Gießen, 1930. 48 Seiten. Mark 2.

Der Verfasser dieses Schriftchens ist der Meinung, daß in den protestantischen Kirchen zu viel gepredigt wird. Jahraus, jahrein dieselben Wahrheiten in derselben Form verkündigen, ermüdet den Prediger und die Gemeinden. Als eine Folge davon haben wir die Tatsache, daß weithin der Pastor vor leeren Bänken predigt, für ihn wie für die wenigen Getreuen eine lähmende Erfahrung. Wie soll es anders werden? Einerseits dadurch, daß die Prediger der Predigt den Tatbeweis kräftiger Teilnahme an der Wohlfahrtspflege hinzufügen und an aller sozialen Arbeit. Andrerseits durch einen größeren Wechsel in der Gestaltung des Gottesdienstes. Verfasser schlägt hier folgendes vor: Man halte an einem Sonntag den Gottesdienst wie gewöhnlich mit Liturgie und Predigt; am nächsten Sonntag folge ein bloß liturgischer Gottesdienst mit viel Gesang; am dritten Sonntag statt dessen ein Vortrag, im Gemeindehaus gehalten. Dann wieder Predigt und Liturgie usw.

Wir fürchten, daß dieser Vorschlag wenig Anwendung finden wird. Unsre Erfahrung ist, daß der gewöhnliche Christ ein Mal am Sonntag zur Kirche gehen und dann einen regelmäßigen Gottesdienst haben will, keinen Vortrag und keine Gesangübung.

Wo Unkirchlichkeit und geistlicher Tod vorhanden ist, weicht er nicht solchen Mitteln.

Adolf von Harnack. Aus der Werkstatt des Vollendeten. Reden und Aufsätze. Alfred Toepelmann-Verlag in Gießen, 1930. 302 Seiten. Geh. M. 8.50, geb. M. 11.

Am 10. Juni 1930 ist Adolf Harnack, der berühmte Kirchenhistoriker und liberale Theologe, hingeschieden. Sein Sohn, Axel v. Harnack, widmet ihm diesen Schlußband von H.s „Reden und Aufsätzen" zum Nachruf. Er enthält fünf Abschnitte. Aus dem ersten: „Zur eigenen Lebensgeschichte" hat uns besonders der Aufsatz über Graf von Bandissen, den Alttestamentler und Freund H.s, interessiert

Der zweite: „Aus dem religiösen und theologischen Wirken" ist besonders reichhaltig.

An die Barthschen Anhänger richtet er hier 15 Fragen, in welchen er der dialektischen Theologie wieder und wieder vorhält, daß historisches Wissen und kritisches Nachdenken nötig seien, um von dem „Worte Gottes" und sei-

nem Evangelium das rechte Verständnis und eine haltbare Theologie zu erhalten. Der schönste Aufsatz in dieser Reihe ist aber der über „Weihnachten." Zwar sind ihm die Geburtserzählungen der Evangelien Legenden, aber er spricht doch über Weihnachten und seine Botschaft so schön, so packend, so religiös, daß man ihn nur bewundern kann. Andre Themata sind hier: „Kann das deutsche Volk gerettet werden?" (1925) und ein Rückblick auf „Möhler, Diepenbrock und Doellinger," die bekannten katholischen Theologen.

Im dritten Abschnitt, „Zur Weihnachtsgeschichte," ist ein Aufsatz über Kant, oder vielmehr eine Gedächtnisrede zur Einweihung seines Grabmals in Königsberg, der man die tiefe Verehrung vor den Geistesbauten dieses größten deutschen Philosophen innig abfühlt.

Es folgen noch Beiträge über das Wirken der preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, die von hohem Interesse sind, sowie Gratulationen (z. B. an N. Söderblom, Martin Rade, Hans Delbrück und andre) und eine Gedächtnisrede für den Kirchenhistoriker Karl Holl.

Mit einem Wort: ein höchst reichhaltiges Buch, auf welches man das Wort anwenden kann: Greift nur hinein ins volle Menschenleben, und wo ihr's packt, da ist's interessant.

Das Buch sei allen unsern Lesern aufs wärmste und nachdrücklichste empfohlen. Ein jeder, der es kauft, wird auf seine Kosten kommen.

Zwei treffliche Bilder des Entschlafenen sind beigegeben, eins aus seinen fünfziger Jahren, das sein aristokratisches Aeußere wiedergibt, und eins aus seinem achtzigsten Lebensjahr, mehr runzlig aber charaktervoll.